

THE  
SATURDAY REVIEW  
OF  
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 995, Vol. 38.

November 21, 1874.

[Registered for  
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

MR. DISRAELI AND GERMANY.

AS might have been expected, the German press considered itself entitled to find fault with Mr. DISRAELI'S speech at Guildhall. It seemed as if the English PRIME MINISTER had made a very unnecessary and a very unfavourable reference to the conduct of the German Government in the ARNIM business; and it must be owned that, had Mr. DISRAELI done this, he would have fairly laid himself open to criticism. It seemed impossible to understand to what he could be referring, if not to Count ARNIM and his imprisonment, when he talked of arrests and domiciliary visits, to which in some foreign countries noblemen were exposed; and the German Government itself probably shared the opinion that it was being talked against sufficiently to inquire what Mr. DISRAELI had said and had meant to say. Mr. DISRAELI at once took frankly and heartily the most sensible line. He gave it to be understood once for all through a special communication to the *Times*, that he did not mean to refer in any way to the German Government, that his remarks had nothing to do with Count ARNIM, and that in what he said about arrests and domiciliary visits he had only before his mind the generally deplorable condition of all the Continental nobility. Of course the German Government, and Germans generally, have nothing to do but to accept this explanation and let the matter drop. It is not for them to look a gift horse in the mouth. But our French friends are not inclined to let off so easily either Mr. DISRAELI or England. They will have it that this disclaimer was only the polite and official manner of owning that a mistake had been made, and of correcting this mistake. Mr. DISRAELI, these French critics say, evidently did mean to use the boasted liberty of a Briton, and to denounce the tyranny of BISMARCK. Standing in Guildhall, and, as Mr. JOHN LEMOINNE expressly points out, having GOG and MAGOG to back him, he defied Germany, and said what he pleased. But after the feast came the reckoning. The great BISMARCK was angry and let it be known he was angry, and instantly Mr. DISRAELI'S valour collapsed. He made what, although veiled in diplomatic language, amounted to a humble apology. He had to eat his words, and to own that the living BISMARCK was superior to the dead idols of Guildhall. This drives Paris wild with delight. Here is Albion, which once was as proud as it was perfidious, literally humbled in the dust. England, like the rest of the world, kotoos to the man of blood and iron. He holds up the rod, and she kisses it; he nods, and she trembles. This is not merely to reduce England to the present low level of France, although even that would have been a pleasant spectacle. It puts England far below France. The French Foreign Office is avowedly afraid of BISMARCK, and Duke DECAZES would no more dare to refer in a public speech to Count ARNIM'S arrest than a Danish or an Austrian Minister would dare. But then France at least fought hard against holding her present position. She has been brought to accept it by the sword and by famine. England, on the contrary, has never dared to strike a blow. Big words are enough to frighten her, and her PRIME MINISTER yields at discretion to the orders of Berlin. Do not you feel heartily ashamed of yourselves, you English? asks Mr. LEMOINNE. Does not your GOG bow down and your MAGOG stoop? Are you not burning with regret and mortification? and do you not in your hearts envy the gallant French, who at least did not cry out till they were hit? Such are the questions which, with their usual ingenuity, our French friends put to us;

and our only answer is, that although we are sorry to disappoint them, we must confess that we have no sense of shame whatever, that we are perfectly comfortable, and that, so far as we can see, GOG and MAGOG look exactly as they did a fortnight ago.

We will assume, merely for the purposes of argument, that the French are right in saying that Mr. DISRAELI'S disclaimer is only a roundabout way of expressing a regret that he should have used indiscreet language. Let us suppose that he did make a mistake, that he subsequently saw his mistake, and took this method of correcting it. This is what Parisian journalists say really happened. They put the case at the worst, and this is the worst at which they put it. We may be quite content to meet them on their own ground, and on this ground the very different ways in which Englishmen and Frenchmen would view the matter are curiously striking. We have here none of the French susceptibility as to owning ourselves wrong. We do not think the very least the worse of ourselves for admitting that we have been mistaken. We even sometimes appear to enjoy the luxury of our own woe, and find a subtle pleasure in traversing the abysses of penitence. Probably no nation, having any pretence to greatness, ever ate so much dirt as we swallowed while the *Alabama* Arbitration business was going on; but we only smiled as we stuffed our mouths with mud, and stuttered out "Mi Yankee, non angit." If Mr. DISRAELI was wrong, we like him to say that he was wrong. Our pride in frankly confessing our faults fully equals the pride of the French in stoutly denying theirs. If Mr. DISRAELI had meant to refer to Count ARNIM, the German Government would have been quite right in resenting his indiscretion. This is enough for us. Our side was wrong, their side was right. We acknowledge this, and there is an end of the matter. The Parisians do not condescend to go into details of this kind. It is idle in their eyes to inquire whether what was supposed to have been said was the right thing to say. It had been said, and men of honour always stick to what they say. If they did not, may be the secret thought of the Parisian mind, what would become of duelling? It is these paltry explanations that play the very mischief with a quarrel. If a gentleman before he raps out his sword stops to inquire whether the language he may have happened to use is justifiable, what is the use of his being a gentleman and having a sword to rap out? From what may be termed the DUGALD DALGETTY point of view this reasoning is certainly very cogent; but those who care more for getting through the business of life satisfactorily than for the laws of the duello may comfort themselves by observing that to own a mistake, when made, not only seems somehow more right than to brazen it out, but greatly conduces to the commodious transaction of affairs. Some day, perhaps, we shall be anxious to obtain explanations from the German Government. It will do something, or say something, or threaten something, that we should like to understand a little more clearly. If such a case arises, we shall at least now be able to feel that we start fair, that we are only asking to be done by as we have done, and that we can discuss the topic in which we shall then be interested on the basis of its being recognized that to give proper explanations, to recede from false positions, and to repair indiscretions carries with it no necessary humiliation.

If there is anything in our way of looking at such a matter which will astonish our French critics, they might

be still more astonished if they could be brought to understand that such an indiscretion as that which they assume Mr. DISRAELI to have made and owned would not injure him in any way in English opinion. He would be thought just as much of after it as before. His opponents would naturally make what little gain they could out of a trifle. They would point out that when he was in Opposition he was always making capital out of the indiscreet utterances of Liberals, and protesting that it was the first business of a statesman to measure his language; and they would be elated to find that he too could blunder when his time of office came. But they would not really think that they injured him, or that he had injured himself. He would be just as much above every man in his party as he had been. It is only of very eminent men that this can be said, but it can be said with perfect certainty of them. There never was a people that stuck to its men of the first rank with so much fidelity as the English do, and this national characteristic is one of the strongest incentives to exertion and rewards of merit which statesmen can have to animate and satisfy them. There are some men in each generation who, while constantly and keenly criticized, seem to have risen above criticism. They belong not only to Parliament and to their party, but to the nation, and the nation will not give them up. In the days of the greatest glories and successes of the GLADSTONE Ministry, when the Conservatives were crushed and powerless, and every one was warming himself by the blaze of some burning question, no one was so cheered whenever he appeared in public as Mr. DISRAELI. Now that the tables are turned, whatever Mr. GLADSTONE may do, whether he stays in Wales or comes to London, whether he moves resolutions or abandons them, whether he writes on Ritualists as if they were a quaint savage tribe whose customs he had not had time to understand before he sailed away, or whether he writes a pamphlet to show that he has found out what it would have been just as easy for him to have found out four years ago—he is equally the great, the glorious, the indispensable GLADSTONE. There are probably not ten men in all Flintshire who, when Mr. GLADSTONE cuts down a tree, would not like to be allowed to carry off a chip in their waistcoat pocket. If Mr. GLADSTONE made a speech in the House consisting of fifty lines from the First Iliad, and Mr. DISRAELI replied with fifty verses from the Lamentations of JEREMIAH, each would be thought to have spoken well in his own rather peculiar style. The *Times* would explain that they were both "artists," and every one would be satisfied. This may be an odd state of things in the eyes of foreigners; but it is one which they should strive to realize and comprehend if they wish to understand England. They might find something exaggerated, something perhaps even childish, in the feeling which English statesmen of the first rank awaken in Englishmen; but they could scarcely come to the end of their meditations without arriving at the conclusion that it is in a great measure owing to the existence of this feeling that England possesses the peculiar type of statesmen of which it is most proud.

#### MR. GLADSTONE AND THE LIBERAL PARTY.

NOTWITHSTANDING the differences of opinion by which the Liberal party is at present divided, all sections are happily unanimous on one point of primary and immediate importance. Sir HENRY JAMES, Mr. LEATHAM, Mr. RICHARD, and Mr. FAWCETT agree that, for the promotion of the various or opposite public objects in which they are severally interested, it is indispensable to retain Mr. GLADSTONE as leader. Mr. CHAMBERLAIN indeed significantly remarked that Mr. GLADSTONE had earned a right to repose, if he chose to claim it, as the reward of his labours; but all members of Parliament who have lately addressed Liberal meetings insist, with more complimentary earnestness, on the continuance of Mr. GLADSTONE's services. Mr. RICHARD went out of his way to explain some incidental reasons for avoiding a change in the leadership of the party. It had been, he said, a pitiable spectacle to see the occupants of the front Opposition bench contending with one another for the allegiance of followers who regarded them all with distrust and indifference. On one occasion during the Indian campaign of 1857, when Sir COLIN CAMPBELL extricated a part of his forces from an embarrassing situation, it was observed that the cheer which greeted his arrival at the scene of

action was a vote of want of confidence in the commanding officer whom he superseded. In the same manner Mr. RICHARD's enthusiastic belief in Mr. GLADSTONE is partly intended as a censure on the colleagues who endeavour to represent him in his absence. There can be no doubt that the best argument for retaining a competent functionary is that it is difficult or impossible to replace him. It would be unfair both to Mr. GLADSTONE and to his eulogists to attribute their repeated offers of adhesion exclusively to negative causes. Fidelity and loyalty are among the best of political virtues; and it would be discreditable to those who shared and applauded Mr. GLADSTONE's triumphs to desert him in his temporary adversity. Whether he is in office or in opposition, it is evident that he cannot promote both the policy of Sir H. JAMES and the policy of Mr. LEATHAM; but either section of his followers may hope that he will take a longer or shorter time to think thrice before he denounces the institutions which they respectively cherish and dislike. The expectations of the advanced Liberals are more plausible, and they are probably more sincere, than the confidence of their unfriendly allies. It is scarcely probable that Mr. GLADSTONE will during the remainder of his political career sustain the part of PALMERSTON, who seldom defended an obstinate prejudice, and never permitted an organic change. His successor in the lead of the Liberal party is by a necessity of his own nature always deeply in earnest, and profoundly convinced of the importance of the measures which he may happen to advocate at the moment. It is difficult to feel violent excitement in the prospect of letting well alone. The human race has not been regenerated by the causes and motives which have hitherto operated; and perhaps the millennium may be attained by electoral districts, by subdivision of land, or by the abolition of the Established Church. Subversive politicians, when they express confidence in Mr. GLADSTONE, imply their disbelief in his permanent adhesion to any of his former convictions.

Although Mr. GLADSTONE in the early part of the last Session intimated a doubt whether he should hold his position after the present year, it may be conjectured that he has no intention of an abdication which would be premature and unnecessary. Whatever may be thought of his defects, he has no competitor in his party. It is evident that his interest in public affairs is unabated, for he is still prone to commit the error of intervening too frequently in political conflicts. Private friendship rather excused than justified his unnecessary interference in the late election at Wenlock. There was no entanglement which required to be removed by a superior power descending from the exalted regions in which Prime Ministers dwell. Some time since, Mr. DISRAELI, then in opposition, made a similar mistake with reference to a Bath election, and the result was not encouraging to statesmen who are tempted to be officious in petty matters. It is difficult to judge whether Mr. GLADSTONE's activity in another department of controversy is suggested by political or ecclesiastical motives. His Essay on Ritualism, though it contained no reference to the real principle in dispute, was still more remotely connected with politics than with theology; but his pamphlet on the policy of the Vatican purported to relate exclusively to the civil allegiance of Roman Catholics. Mr. RICHARD and one or two other Nonconformists have since expressed their approval of declarations which seem to alienate Mr. GLADSTONE from Roman Catholic sympathies. More careful and more impartial critics have not failed to observe that Mr. GLADSTONE either intrudes into an alien controversy or identifies himself to some extent with one of the disputants. In any case it was not the business of a great leader of a party to prove that any section of his countrymen ought to renounce either their theological belief or their civil allegiance. Politicians in general look at such questions rather from the point of view of a Parliamentary Whip than as students of canon law or of ecclesiastical history. When they inquire into the probable consequences of Mr. GLADSTONE's publication, they will not fail to apprehend that the quarrel which he has gratuitously fastened on the Roman Catholic clergy may hereafter not improbably impede his return to office. The Irish members, who are for the moment comparatively powerless in the House of Commons, are likely to form an indispensable part of a revived Liberal majority. As far as they are compelled to consult the prejudices of the priests, they will probably refuse their support to the assailant of the infallible POPE. Fortunately



for Mr. GLADSTONE, Mr. DISRAELI also has lately thought fit to assume the character of a Protestant champion; but the Irish hierarchy will justly calculate that the PRIME MINISTER is more open to a possible negotiation than his serious and conscientious adversary. If the pamphlet on the Vatican Decrees permanently deprives Mr. GLADSTONE of the votes of twenty Irish members, it will have done more harm to the Liberal party than to the Ultramontanists. There can be little doubt that, if he had consulted his followers, they would have deprecated the publication of the pamphlet.

It is well known that the Moderate Liberals, though they prudently profess confidence in Mr. GLADSTONE, have no desire to accelerate his return to office. They are perfectly aware that for some time to come their party must be in a minority, unless it should profit by some unforeseen popular excitement, of which they would themselves disapprove. In the occasional contests which have occurred since the general election there has hitherto been no sign of a reaction against the Conservative movement. Even the expression by the Scotch University students of their political preferences, though in itself unimportant, is probably a reflection of the prevailing opinion of the middle classes. Mr. DISRAELI and Lord DERBY are preferred to their opponents because the Government of which they are principal members is for the present popular. Liberal members in their addresses to their constituents either confine themselves to barren criticism on the details of business in the last Session, or expound, in the spirit of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN and Mr. LEATHAM, doctrines which may perhaps be adopted by the country in the distant future. When they invite the patronage of Mr. GLADSTONE for democratic or revolutionary projects, they justify to the utmost of their power the impression which produced the overthrow of his Government. There is no reason to suppose that the constituencies are better inclined at the end of the year than they were at the beginning to tolerate a policy of recklessness and disturbance. Mr. GLADSTONE will not at present be recalled to power merely for the purpose of making all classes anxious, and all interests insecure. If Mr. GLADSTONE possessed either the steadiness of PEEL or the solid common sense of PALMERSTON, he would receive a large share of the support which is now unwillingly accorded to Mr. DISRAELI. If the prevailing opinion is Conservative, it is also Liberal, and it only inclines to the party now in office as the alternative of the supremacy of an extreme faction. In his unseasonable letter to the unsuccessful candidate for Wenlock Mr. GLADSTONE expounded with sufficient accuracy the true creed of a Liberal party which would both correct abuses and respect existing institutions. He would be more fully trusted if he were not claimed as a leader by those who would spare no existing institution. It is true that he has not yet declared his conversion to revolutionary theories, but there can be no doubt that the violent faction have plausible grounds for a confidence which is founded, not on his professions, but on his temperament and on his recent history. Old-fashioned Liberals, on the other hand, hope to exercise a certain control over the leader of a party which can only be saved from disruption by prudence and moderation. If Mr. GLADSTONE were to retire from the House of Commons, or from his responsible position as leader, the Radicals would provide for themselves a successor more easily than the representatives of the former Whigs. In the meantime allies who are in principle irreconcilably hostile to one another have sufficient reasons for loyalty to the only leader who may perhaps prolong for a time their artificial union.

#### THE PROSPECTS OF BONAPARTISM.

THE change which has come over the prospects of the Imperialist party is the most striking feature in French politics. It is all the more striking because scarcely any part of it is attributable to the action of the Imperialists themselves. The stars in their course have fought for Bonapartism. The mistakes of its enemies and the progress of events have alike helped it. And now the difficulties which beset the establishment of the Republic are leading men to ask whether, after all, the restoration of the Empire would not be the best thing that could happen; whether France has not more to gain and less to lose by this settlement than by any other; whether the Empire, under the new conditions under which it would be tried, does not promise to secure the essentials of good govern-

ment with less risk of failure than the Republic; whether, in short, wise and patriotic Frenchmen ought not to ally themselves with the Bonapartists in the hope of guiding and purifying them, instead of, as hitherto, offering an opposition which has its origin in nothing better than prejudice—prejudice no doubt founded on experience, but which fails to make due allowance for the qualifications which experience needs when it comes to be applied to the future. The main consideration on which this reasoning rests is the absence of any necessary connexion between Imperialism and that band of adventurers who founded and worked the Second Empire. It is admitted that if the Court of NAPOLEON IV. were to be a mere reproduction of his father's, an Imperialist restoration would not count among the alternatives between which good men have to make their choice. But the services of the men who constituted and gave character to the Court of NAPOLEON III. will not, it is said, be indispensable, or even helpful, to his successor. NAPOLEON IV. will be able to choose his supporters from among honest men, and when he is seen to do so, many of the stern politicians who now suspect the Imperial system will be willing to take part in working it. They will be the more disposed to do this because the special danger of Bonapartism is less formidable than the special danger of Republicanism. The Empire may be corrupt, but the Republic is very likely to lead to anarchy, and corruption is at all events more easily controlled than anarchy. If the Empire can be kept decently pure—and with the adventurers weeded out there is no reason why this should not be managed—it will secure order better than the Republic, and it will give Frenchmen as much liberty as they care to have. In fact, it will be very like a superior edition of the Septennate—the Septennate, that is, organized and made perpetual, and having a NAPOLEON instead of a MACMAHON at its head. In this last comparison, it is said, lies another reason why moderate and reasonable Frenchmen are likely to favour the Empire. The present Government, with all its faults, has kept things going with fair success, and if it continues to do this for six years more, the country will have got so well used to personal government that the accession of a BONAPARTE will seem the most natural thing to follow.

With the assumption which underlies this reasoning we entirely agree. Forms of government are things indifferent, provided that the substance of good government is assured. France may be free, tranquil, and prosperous alike under an Empire, a Republic, or a Constitutional Monarchy. The question at any given moment is under which form, all things considered, she is most likely to enjoy these advantages. The great fault of French politicians has been their inability to believe this. They have wished for the right things, but they have refused to believe that they could attain them except in one particular way. The moderate Republican and the Orleanist have had their separate formulas, and they have clung to them, not because they stand for different ideas, but because each has refused to see that the other's formula and his own can stand for the same ideas. Now any change of government is open to the objection that it tends to perpetuate this exclusiveness. France is in name a Republic. If she once more becomes an Empire, this will be a fresh declaration that there is some occult connexion between the Empire and good government. Such an announcement will at once set the Republicans to work to prove that there is some occult incompatibility between the Empire and good government. Consequently the parties opposed to the Government, instead of considering how they can modify its policy and use the power it possesses for the promotion of their own views, will go on scheming how to supplant one Government by another. The change to which they look forward will still be a revolution. This reflection may well make prudent Frenchmen hesitate before they quarrel with the existing Government, whatever faults they may see in it.

Again, it is conceded that, if the Empire is to be set up again to any good purpose, it must be by the co-operation of a class of politicians who were not formerly friendly to it. Its original promoters having been got rid of, its affairs will be managed by a respectable set of directors. But why should these directors associate themselves with the Empire rather than with the competing Company? They have the game so far in their hands that neither rival can obtain lasting power except by their aid. This indeed is the one feature in which the present condition of France is superior to her condition at any former time. The mode-

rate party, by whatever name it is called, has a better knowledge of its own power. It will be said that the fact that it is the moderate party must necessarily indispose it to a form of government which, as has been admitted, may lead to anarchy. But the factions which threaten the Republic with anarchy will not be swept out of existence by the re-establishment of the Empire. They will still exist as an element of danger in the French political system, and their enthusiasm will be only increased by the renewed necessity of stifling all expression of it. Republican fanaticism under a strong Republic is like an explosion in the open air. Republican fanaticism under any other form of government is like an explosion under cover. The force which may be harmlessly scattered in the one case is compressed and made destructive in the other. Some at least of this fanaticism has more to do with names than with things. There are many Republicans probably who would never quite lay aside the conspirator's cloak under an Empire, but would be perfectly content provided that the form of the Government were Republican. Of course this worship of particular phrases is a political error. But what French politicians have to consider is, how this political error may be best deprived of its sting. To take a single instance; there can be no question that M. GAMBETTA has of late exercised very great influence over the extreme Republicans in the direction of self-restraint; and his youth, character, and antecedents make it probable that, under any circumstances, he will continue to be a powerful factor in French politics. But there will be an immense difference between his position under a Republic and under an Empire. In the latter case his occupation will be gone. He cannot play any conspicuous part without either defying the established order of things or abandoning all the convictions with which his name is associated. In other words, his choice will lie between making himself an instrument of dissension, and consequently of weakness, and losing all power over his followers. He must be either a dangerous agitator or a despised renegade.

There is another consideration which, though it rests at present upon no trustworthy data, ought still not to be altogether disregarded. It is assumed, and very possibly correctly assumed, that there will be nothing to prevent NAPOLEON IV. from playing the part of a quiet and respectable sovereign of a fairly constitutional type. If so, he will certainly have many advantages over any other ruler who is likely to be set up in France. His name will be popular with the army and with a large section of the peasantry; and the very greatness of his father's reverse will invest his son with a romantic interest that is not to be despised even in politics. But hereditary character will sometimes override all the warnings of prudence, and it is yet to be seen whether NAPOLEON IV. will be so little of a BONAPARTE as to rest satisfied with the useful but humdrum part which this calculation of the future assigns to him. If his father could have been thus commonplace in his aspirations, he might have died in the purple. But NAPOLEON III. seems to have had a genuine disbelief in Parliamentary government and constitutional forms which made it impossible for him to work by them so long as he saw a chance of working by any other means. He was as little fitted for the post of constitutional King as Mr. CARLYLE would be for the post of constitutional Minister. This unfitness may not have descended to his son. But the BONAPARTES are not an ordinary family, and speculations which assume that in the next generation they are to become so may after all be falsified by the event.

#### THE REFORM CONFERENCE.

A LITTLE knot of agitators has lately held a little Reform Conference with the result, if not for the purpose, of showing how little interest is at present taken in schemes for remodelling the Constitution. The commonplaces of electoral reform are too hackneyed to admit of any show of novelty, and the only curiosity which is aroused by notices of reform meetings relates to the names of the promoters, and not to their arguments. Of the late meeting at the Freemasons' Hall it is enough to say that it was assembled at the invitation, and was to have been held under the presidency, of Mr. BEAL. That indefatigable patriot has not enough to do in creating a new Municipality in London and in pro-

pounding to the Board of Trade the principles on which gas is to be supplied. In concert with Captain MAXSE and a few other zealous democrats Mr. BEAL has found time to conduct an agitation for Parliamentary Reform through all its conventional stages. In such cases the first step is for the managers of the movement to call themselves a preliminary meeting, at which, after laying down certain propositions, they appoint themselves a Committee to draw up a Report, which is, like a House of Commons Address, an echo of the original programme. On his third or fourth appearance the principal promoter takes the chair in an assemblage which is in all cases composed of the same elements. At a second or afternoon meeting it is customary, if possible, to procure the attendance of some member of Parliament, and on the late occasion Mr. BROGDEN accepted the invitation of Mr. BEAL. Mr. HOWELL and Mr. ODGER were of course not absent from a democratic gathering; and no celebration of the kind is thought satisfactory without the attendance of Mr. ARCH. It is not the fault of speakers on such occasions that they take for granted the only proposition which is seriously in dispute. The figures which they glibly manipulate clearly prove that electoral representation is not at present equally distributed. So many small boroughs return so many members, while Liverpool and Manchester and Birmingham, with a population many times larger, only return so many more. From time to time a careless speaker or journalist of another order has described the existing inequalities as anomalies, and the assembled reformers eagerly quote his admission. If, in truth, it is desirable that the numerical majority of the population should exercise absolute power, the English Constitution, with all its recent democratic modifications, is wholly indefensible. Mr. BEAL's figures are probably accurate, and the main objection to the adoption of his doctrines is not that symmetry has been already attained, but that the exclusion from political power of the upper and middle classes would probably not conduce to good government. The Electoral Reform Association, having informally appealed to public opinion, finds that its strength is represented by an active local politician, by two or three obscure members of Parliament, and by the extreme revolutionists who, like Mr. ODGER, would equalize property as well as electoral districts. The rest of the community is either opposed or indifferent to the proposed changes.

The petty club which under many names employs itself in the business of agitation is itself divided on questions of expediency, if not of principle. The gentleman from Birmingham who acted as Mr. BEAL's substitute took credit in his opening address for the moderation of his proposals, while he at the same time appealed to the sympathies of his audience by hinting that he would not be satisfied with the concession of his immediate demands. Parliament and the country are gravely asked to make comparatively moderate concessions to demagogues who confidentially inform their followers that, having once obtained uniform suffrage and equal electoral districts, they will have no difficulty in enforcing the remainder of their claims. It is impossible to deny that they are logically in the right, but for rhetorical or persuasive purposes it might be more judicious to practise a politic reserve. It is precisely on the ground that equal electoral districts would paralyse resisting forces that prudent and moderate politicians close their ears to Mr. BEAL's seductive and plausible statistics. In the particular instance, the moderation of the managers of the Conference must have been assumed, not for the purpose of securing unanimity among the audience, but of quieting the imaginary alarms of an indifferent community. Captain MAXSE and Mr. ODGER are as far advanced in democratic convictions as Mr. BEAL or Mr. WRIGHT; and the meeting in general sympathized only with extreme opinions. Amendments to the principal resolutions were moved and carried, and Mr. BEAL and his Committee seem to have unnecessarily exposed themselves to a series of rebuffs. Their next mortifying defeat was inflicted by Miss LYDIA BECKER and some other spirited ladies. Although the Chairman ruled that a motion in favour of female suffrage was foreign to the objects of the meeting, Miss BECKER and her gallant associates successfully insisted on a share in the proposed dilution of the suffrage. Whatever may be thought of the so-called rights of women in general, it would be difficult to resist their claims on the principles of the Electoral Reform Association. When it is once assumed that the right of voting is a personal privilege, and



that any consideration of the purposes to which it may be applied ought not to affect constitutional legislation, it follows that no incapacity ought to exclude women from the franchise. In spite of the efforts of the managing Committee, the Association resolved that Mr. FORSYTH should be asked, in common with Mr. TREVELYAN and Sir C. DILKE, to contribute his share to the deterioration of the electoral body. The power of Parliament and of the constituencies has been so firmly established during the long prevalence of a restricted suffrage, that democratic reformers have hitherto not foreseen the danger of transferring the centre of political gravity to some other kind of authority. In many parts of the Continent, including the German Empire, universal suffrage is found consistent with nearly absolute monarchy.

Politicians of higher rank than Mr. BEAL may perhaps learn from the failure of his agitation that they have been tempted to bid for popularity too hastily, and in a wrong direction. With the exception of a sensible speech by Captain MAXSE against the rights of women, the most plausible arguments used at the meeting consisted of references to speeches by Mr. DISRAELI and Mr. GLADSTONE. Flesh and blood are not admitted to the polling-booths in equal proportions; and Mr. TREVELYAN'S Bill for household suffrage in counties would effect only a part of the objects of which Mr. GLADSTONE has from time to time approved. The countenance which Mr. DISRAELI has given to the Reform agitation is probably to be explained by the apparent and temporary success of his last experiment of the same kind. In the debate on Mr. TREVELYAN'S Bill Mr. DISRAELI confined himself with ostentatious reserve to collateral or incidental objections to the immediate concession of household suffrage in counties. It is not certain whether he was at the time preparing the way for a future change of policy, or only covering his retreat from a position which he had imprudently occupied. His appeal to the regard of the small boroughs for their own political privileges will not be forgotten by those concerned; and since the close of the Session the Government has received notice that the farmers are not prepared to acquiesce without resistance in virtual disfranchisement. Two months ago the official managers of elections imprudently adopted a candidate for Cambridgeshire who may probably have deserved the confidence of the Government. The tenant farmers had already elected Mr. RODWELL, because in the neighbouring county of Suffolk he had taken a leading part in resisting the dictation of the Labourers' Union. If Mr. DISRAELI should at any time attempt to carry Mr. TREVELYAN'S Bill, he will encounter uncompromising resistance in Cambridgeshire, and probably in other counties. The ends for which Mr. ARCH and his adherents would use political power are fully understood by the objects of their hostility.

The noblemen and gentlemen who have followed Mr. BEAL in the promotion of the London Municipal Government Bill will perhaps begin to doubt the wisdom of their conduct when they learn that their leader is the political ally of Mr. ODGER and Mr. HOWELL. The modest proposal of handing over the corporate property to the outlying districts of the metropolis is perfectly consistent with the principles of the chief members of the Electoral Reform Association. If the precedent of seizing corporate estates were once established by Parliament, a heavy blow would have been struck against the security of private property. Some enthusiastic democrats may perhaps hope that a municipal government elected by household or universal suffrage would, like the Commune of Paris, sometimes protect and sometimes overawe a House of Commons which would derive its commission from a similar constituency. Thus far Mr. BEAL has succeeded better as a corporation reformer than as a political agitator. No Conservative peers attended his meeting at the Freemasons' Tavern, nor would Lord ELCHO be inclined to introduce a Bill for the establishment of equal electoral districts. The very newspapers which welcomed the project of the Municipal Bill with inconsiderate applause scarcely allow one or two columns in the dead season of the year to the report of the proceedings of the Electoral Association.

#### THE POPULATION OF FRANCE.

THE volumes of elaborate statistics on France as compared with other countries which M. BLOCK has recently published, give, among other things, some very curious information on the population of France. The

wealth which France has recently been discovered to possess has taken many persons by surprise. There must have been a vast amount of wealth accumulated by Frenchmen of all ranks to enable them to collect in two or three years so many millions sterling for investment in their new Rentes; and that the vast proportion of these new Rentes is held in France is made obvious by the very small amount of coupons for which France has now to make provision in foreign countries. When the issue was first made by M. THIERS, it was largely by foreigners, and particularly by Englishmen and Germans, that the loan was taken. But gradually the French have bought their own stocks, and now the proportion of the French debt which is held out of France is very inconsiderable. What is interesting to notice is that the wealth and the accumulation of wealth which these facts indicate are the acquisitions of a population which, if not stationary, increases very slowly indeed. M. BLOCK is proud of this, and sees in it a proof of the enlightenment and good sense of the nation to which he belongs. Political economists for a long time taught the doctrine that the road to prosperity was to keep the population within the limits of comfortable subsistence. M. BLOCK says that what MALTHUS preached the French have practised. But he says that the process is not due to a sudden and violent conquest of human nature, but simply to the gradual perception of what is fitting and necessary, which goes with increasing civilization and intelligence. Overpopulation is, according to this view, only possible where the people are degraded, ignorant, and without hope or ambition. Civilized people will be guided in the matter by the most obvious attention to what their own interests demand. In England a different mode of looking at things prevails. The population of England has doubled within a period in which the population of France has remained almost stationary, and with this rapidly increasing population we associate many things which we prize highly—our very great wealth, our colonial Empire, our habits of independence, our love marriages, our trust that the crumbs will be provided for the sparrows. If we were to argue for ever, Englishmen would rest persuaded that their way is best, and Frenchmen would rest persuaded that their way is best, and it is no use to argue under such circumstances. What is worth noticing is that the French have unconsciously walked in the paths of Malthusian philosophy, and they have reaped the reward which the prophets of political economy assured them would be theirs. They have got wealth; their wealth is diffused through their population; and their wealth is at once the consequence and the cause of the spread through the country of thrifty, industrious, and sober habits.

Since 1801 a census has been taken of the population of France every five years. In 1801 the population was 27,000,000, and in 1806 it was 29,000,000; but the census in its early days was taken so imperfectly that the probability is, not that the population had augmented by 2,000,000 during the wars of NAPOLEON, but that the second census was more accurate than the first. In 1821 the 29,000,000 of 1806 had only become 30,000,000, and at that date the population of England and Wales was only 12,000,000. In 1871 the 30,000,000 of France had become 36,000,000, while the 12,000,000 of England had become 22,000,000. To the 36,000,000 of France we have, in order to estimate the growth of the population, to add 2,000,000 for the lost provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, and then we must deduct 700,000 for the annexed provinces of Savoy and Nice. The real increase of the French population was therefore in fifty years 7,300,000. This is a very inconsiderable proportional increase as compared with that of England. The French gain is almost exactly one-fourth additional, or 25 per cent.; the English gain is five-sixths or 80 per cent. Still seven millions increase is in itself not an insignificant one; but the curious fact revealed by M. BLOCK'S statistics is that the augmentation, such as it was, arose, not from any increase in the number of births, but from the fact that those born live longer. The number of births in France has remained almost stationary for seventy years. In 1806 the number was 916,000. In 1870 it was 943,000. This shows that, as time has gone on and the habits of the people have become more formed, or, in the language of M. BLOCK, as enlightenment has increased, there are fewer births in proportion to the population. It also shows that the average duration of life has increased, more people being alive at the later date, with only the same number of babies to replace them. If people live longer,

this, as M. BLOCK justly argues, shows that the conditions of life are more favourable. There is more comfort, better nourishment, risks in dangerous occupations are better guarded against, medical skill mitigates the ravages of disease. France is thus proved to be better off indirectly, just as the production of so much money to take up the new loans proves the same thing directly. And the same result is arrived at in another way still more indirect. Nature in France, as all over the world, gives the struggling race of man a slight—it is but a very slight—lift, by ordering that the proportion of men born shall be greater than that of women, which, as men are used up faster under the pressure of life than women, is a trifling gain to start with. In France, however, as in almost every other country, there are at any one moment more women alive than men, because the pressure of life more than counterbalances the superiority in number of male births. But what delights M. BLOCK is that his tables show that the numbers of the men and the women alive in France at any one moment tend to become more and more equal. In 1801 there were 48 and a fraction men to every 51 and a fraction women in France, whereas in 1871 there was almost the same figure on each side of the account. There were 49·81 men as against 50·19 women. This result can only be attributed to one cause, and that is that the pressure of life is not so great on men as it used to be. Men live longer because they are not so soon killed off by dangerous occupations, disease, and want. Their numbers accordingly come nearer to those of women, and thus the general condition of the country is again in this way shown to be continually more flourishing.

These statistics suggest what, from the ladies' point of view, may be termed a pleasing picture of the future of humanity. We have often heard of late years in England feminine lamentations over the existence of what was supposed to be in the nature of things an excess of women who on no hypothesis could be married, as there were not the men at command to marry them. What, it has been piteously asked, is to become of this unhappy residuum? and it was answered that they should nobly front their fate, and, by acquiring early habits of industry, learn to gain their own bread, and so be independent of the shortcoming sex. But M. BLOCK comes to the rescue, and shows that something much more delightful than this is possible—namely, that by extending civilization, by inspiring prudence and sobriety, by insisting on precautions in dangerous trades, and by avoiding wars, a larger number of men may be kept alive, the sexes balanced, the melancholy residuum eliminated, and a theoretical husband found for every one. Even as things are, it may be observed that more women are married than men, for the French tables show that every one in six of the men who marry once marries twice, while only one in twelve of women forms a second marriage. Nor is it true that the example of France must be taken to show that the secret of French prosperity lies in any disinclination to marriage, or in not marrying. On the contrary, the French do marry very generally indeed. Of Frenchmen between the ages of thirty-five and forty 80 per cent. are married; and as to disinclination to marriage, M. BLOCK scorns the imputation. He goes into calculations on the subject which are not, indeed, fortified by any actual statistics, for that was from the nature of the case impossible, but which at least show the habitual thoughts and beliefs of an intelligent Frenchman who is familiar with computations of the kind. M. BLOCK estimates that if a hundred Frenchmen were taken, unmarried, but of an age to marry, about 40 per cent. would be found to be prevented by ill health or some similar obstacle from marrying; one, or at most two, would not wish to be married if they could; and all the rest would be longing to be married if they could afford it. This is a most romantic picture of a hundred Frenchmen, and all that can be said of it is that, if it is true, the most determined lady could not find a word to say against France on this score. What then is the secret of French prosperity? It is, according to M. BLOCK, merely that French people are sensible enough to wait. They marry, but they do not marry early. They do not think much of the romance of young lovers. They regard marriage as a pleasant arrangement to enjoy which they must wait and work. The average age at which Frenchmen marry is thirty-one in Paris and thirty in the rest of France. The average age at which Frenchwomen marry is twenty-six in Paris and twenty-five in the rest of France. These ages indicate that marriage is deferred to a date decidedly later

than is customary in England, and the result is that married couples are in France more assured of what answers to the French standard of comfort. It is not, we may repeat, a question of imitating the French, for nations cannot easily imitate one another; but it explains much about France, with its hidden wealth and recuperative powers, which might not otherwise be understood, when these statistics have led us to see that the primary basis of this prosperity is that the average of the women in France are willing or are forced to wait till they are twenty-five to be married.

#### THE RAILWAY WAR.

IT was of course foreseen that, if the Midland Company persisted in carrying out the changes which had been announced in the working of its passenger traffic, other Companies would be compelled either to follow its example or to devise some other means of meeting the threatened competition. And this is what has now occurred. On Tuesday the policy of the Directors of the Midland was formally approved by a large majority of shareholders, and next day the representatives of the London and North-Western, Great Northern, North-Eastern, Lancashire and Yorkshire, Great Western, and Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Companies had a meeting, at which they resolved to recommend their Boards to follow any reduction of prices made by the Midland Company anywhere, to continue second-class carriages at reduced fares, and generally to co-operate in the interests of railway property. It remains to be seen whether this course will be adopted by the various Boards, and sanctioned by the shareholders; but in the meantime it is not surprising that the prospect of bitter, relentless, and probably ruinous, competition which is thus opened up should inspire the holders of railway property with very uncomfortable apprehensions. Whatever might be the ultimate result of such a struggle, it must in the first instance inevitably involve heavy sacrifices and some very serious risks. It would be a mistake to suppose that the vote of the Midland meeting implies serious approval of the resolution of the Board. It is obvious that in such a case the shareholders are necessarily very much in the hands of the Directors. They may have their own views as to what ought to be done, but they have to count the cost of enforcing them, and it is only natural that they should prefer to run the risk even of a dangerous experiment rather than create a revolution at the Board. It is perhaps unnecessary to speculate on the probable results of changes which will immediately be tested by actual experience; but the manner in which, as it now appears, the Directors plunged into their new policy is certainly by no means hopeful. The Chairman in his Circular indignantly repudiated the suggestion that it had been hastily adopted; but it is now explained that, in point of fact, the plan had long ago been before the Board, and had been repeatedly rejected, until at last it was adopted "somewhat suddenly." Before the Directors left the room their decision was in type, and it was instantly published. The refusal to postpone the proposed changes until the other Railway Companies had had time to consider them and to see whether some uniform system could not be arranged also points in the same direction. This nervous precipitancy is an unmistakable symptom which speaks for itself. Everybody knows the state of mind in which people who have for a long period consistently distrusted a particular project suddenly adopt it, and hasten to pledge themselves to it on the instant, lest cooler consideration should again revive their doubts. People who are firm in their conclusions are not afraid of reconsideration and discussion.

There is perhaps no mood in which more fatal errors are committed than that in which there is a disposition to assume that "something must be done" without reference to whether the something is really a wise thing in itself. It seems that the Midland Board has long been dissatisfied with the position of its system. It originally formed part of the route from London to Leeds, York, and Scotland, *via* Rugby and Normanton, and it has never recovered from its discomfiture when a more direct and convenient route was opened. It was hoped that the Settle and Carlisle extension would make the Midland a complete system, independent of its neighbours; but the mere making of a new line is not enough. It must be pushed and advertised; something must be done to call attention to



it and to tempt traffic to come that way. The reference in the Chairman's Circular to the cultivation of commercial traffic is now made clear. Mr. Bass stated on Tuesday that the adhesion of that "important class of the community," commercial travellers, had been secured. It had been ascertained that, if these gentlemen were allowed to ride first class, they "would exercise considerable influence as 'to the way in which the goods they sold should be sent 'to their destination,' that is to say, they would take care to send all they could by the Midland. It must be admitted that this is a great lift for the bagmen, who are thus elevated into a sort of balance of power in the railway system. It is unnecessary to suppose that the Midland Directors have really been foolish enough to be influenced by expectations of this kind, but the fact that they should be put forward for the encouragement of shareholders would seem to indicate at least a significant deficiency in more solid argument. It is characteristic of the spirit in which the Midland Directors have acted throughout the whole of this business that they should have refused to consult with the other Companies as to the best course to be adopted. It is naturally the duty of the Midland to consider its own interests before those of other people, but it is absurd to suppose that it would have been in danger of being persuaded to sacrifice itself for the benefit of the London and North-Western or the Great Northern, or that any number of Companies in combination could compel it to adopt a particular system of working against its will. If the Midland had agreed to a conference, it would still have been perfectly free either to hold to its own policy or to join in the resolutions which might be passed; but it would have had the advantage of hearing all that could be said on the subject, and of considering whether the objects which it has in view could not be attained by some plan which might be generally adopted. All sorts of subjects relating to railway management are constantly brought under discussion in this way; and it is childish to describe a familiar and useful practice as "submitting the policy of a Company to the determination of its rivals."

It is possible that the disastrous warfare which is apparently impending may be averted; but it must be admitted that the obstinate perversity of the Midland Company in refusing to agree either to discussion or delay is necessarily extremely embarrassing to other Companies. It may be doubted whether in the long run the Midland Company will really increase its revenues by the changes which it is going to make; but it is probable that in the outset it will at least augment what will then be its first-class traffic; and in that respect Companies which continued to adhere to the old tariff would be placed at a disadvantage. If, however, the other Companies, as is proposed, reduce both their first and second class fares, they will give all who care to ride first class accommodation equal to that of the Midland, while a great many third-class passengers will be tempted to avail themselves of the cheapened second class. It must be remembered that the recent extension of facilities for third-class traffic has affected all railways more or less. The second class has, as it were, had the bottom knocked out of it, and the traffic has dropped into the class below. The natural way to recover this traffic would seem to be, not to abolish the second class, but to make it more tempting by a reduction of fares, the existing tariff being altogether excessive in proportion to the very meagre difference in accommodation between second and third class carriages. There are a great many people who either cannot afford, or do not think it worth while, to pay the present high second-class fare, but who would gladly pay something over the third-class fare for the sake of avoiding the roughest kind of company; and we should imagine that it would pay very well to cultivate this class. Under the Midland scheme, these people will be left in the third class, and the extra fares which might otherwise be got out of them will be lost, for they will certainly not go first class. It may be said that the Companies which keep up three classes will lose the advantages to be obtained by the Midland in the way of shorter trains and reduced working expenses; but these economies are of a somewhat doubtful kind. It will always pay to run well-filled carriages. As to the first class, there is no reason why other Companies should not in some degree follow the example of the Midland in making passengers understand that, if they want to be sure of privacy or extra room, they must expect to have to pay for it. The abolition on the Midland of reduced fares for return tickets neutralizes the boon conferred by the removal of re-

strictions as to the date of return; but much popularity would be secured by any Company which offered those advantages together. There are undoubtedly various changes which the Companies might make in order to attract passengers, and to place themselves in a favourable position for competing with the new system of the Midland; but the test of the soundness of all measures of this kind should be, not whether they will hurt the Midland, but whether they will actually do good to the Companies by whom they are introduced. The bitter experience of the past should supply a sufficient warning against a war of reckless retaliation and revenge. Some way might surely be found of roasting the pig without burning the house.

#### THE LONDON GAS QUESTION.

THE letter which Mr. FARRER has written in Sir C. ADDERLEY's name to the indefatigable Mr. BEAL will discourage the promoters of the Corporation and Metropolitan Board Gas Bills. Mr. BEAL himself had suggested, in his interview with the PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE, that it was not advisable to revive competition, to break up the streets for the introduction of double sets of mains and of distributing apparatus, and, as he might have added, to throw away hundreds of thousands of pounds in pursuit of an object which is already attained. It was not to be expected that Mr. BEAL and his friends would remonstrate against a violation of the principles hitherto adopted by Parliament, and a wanton destruction of the property of the shareholders. When he remarked that the Corporations would undersell the Companies, or *vice versa*, he involuntarily extenuated the injustice of the proposed measure. Private traders are entirely incapable of competing with public bodies, which can make good their trade losses by means of taxation. Sir C. ADDERLEY is equally silent with Mr. BEAL on the protection which is due to property acquired in reliance on the faith of Parliament. He may ascertain, if he inquires into the question, that Parliamentary Committees have uniformly refused to sanction the competition of corporate bodies with existing Companies for the supply of gas and water; but perhaps in his answer to the deputation he may have intentionally confined himself to the task of stating the objections to Mr. BEAL's proposals. As Sir C. ADDERLEY justly remarks, the history of past legislation is not favourable to any attempt on the part of Government to enforce amalgamation as a step to further measures. In substance the Board of Trade seems to agree with Mr. BEAL in the questionable proposition that large savings in the cost of supply and administration might be effected by the reduction in the number of Companies; but Sir C. ADDERLEY and his advisers deserve credit for a desire to promote economy by enlisting the interest of the Companies in the promotion of improvements.

It is not improbable that, in the presence of a more formidable agitation, the City of London and even the Metropolitan Board of Works may reconsider their intention of attacking the Gas Companies. The owners of private and corporate property too often connive at isolated attacks on the rights of their neighbours; but when they are themselves simultaneously assailed, they may be expected to feel a certain regard for vested interests. When the deputation for abolishing the privileges of the City of London waited upon Mr. CROSS, Mr. HENRY COLE urged as one of the reasons for constituting a metropolitan municipality the advantage of obtaining gas at cost price. If an advocate of the Corporation had objected that one element of cost ought to be the purchase at a fair value of the property of the Companies, Mr. COLE might have replied that the City itself had given notice of a Bill for the establishment of a subsidized competition. The susceptibilities of the Corporation may perhaps be quickened by the knowledge that it has a common enemy with its own proposed victims in the person of Mr. BEAL. The professed hope that the Corporation would be, by Mr. BEAL's blandishments, tempted to commit suicide was probably from the first but a diplomatic fiction. If any illusion prevailed on the subject, Lord Mayors, Aldermen, and Liverymen have lost no time in disabasing the minds of their opponents. When Lord ELCHO brings forward his Bill for transferring the corporate property to strangers, the City of London will do well, instead of discussing the comparative utility of the present system and the proposed substitute, to take its stand on the simple ground of unquestioned possession,

and to deny the expediency or justice in any circumstances of compulsory expropriation. Mr. BEAL and Mr. COLE may not inconsistently demand on behalf of their future municipality the exclusive control of the gas and water supply of London. The Corporation will greatly weaken its own position if it is at the same time defending itself and attacking Joint-Stock Companies.

If the gas consumers or their representatives satisfy themselves that unnecessary expenses are at present incurred by the Companies, they may reasonably insist on the purchase of the property. The consumers are the beneficial owners of surplus profits after the payment of limited dividends; and Sir C. ADDERLEY is justified in his belief that the Companies, having attained their maximum receipts, have no strong interest in the further improvement of the property. The simplest mode of escaping from the consequences of former legislation would be to transfer the supply of gas on equitable terms to some public body. In the answer of the PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE to the deputation a more complicated plan is recommended. "It deserves serious consideration whether, the terms of the ultimate purchase being first determined, the Companies should not be allowed on complete amalgamation to increase their dividend beyond the present fixed limit in some fixed proportion to any reduction they may thus effect in the price of gas." If all Sir C. ADDERLEY's assumptions proved to be correct, much might be said in favour of the principle which he adopts; but it is doubtful whether any considerable expense would be saved by amalgamation, inasmuch as the productive resources of the larger Companies are required for their present use. Within a few years the Companies and their customers have suffered extreme inconvenience from delays interposed by the Legislature in the way of their providing additional premises and works. Vast sums have been since expended on the purchase of land and the construction of works; and the Board of Trade greatly exaggerates the alleged waste under the present system. It may perhaps be true that a smaller number of places of manufacture would be sufficient if the works were now all to be constructed for the first time; but if the Companies were amalgamated, they would find it cheaper to maintain the present sources of supply than to abandon them for larger works. The Board of Trade cannot be supposed to have investigated the complicated reasons which have determined the choice of sites for the manufacture of gas. The necessity of avoiding as far as possible populous neighbourhoods accounts for some of the apparent anomalies which may be discerned on the face of the map. In other respects no considerable saving would result from a diminution in the actual number of Companies. The cost of the Boards themselves is insignificant, and it would seldom be practicable after amalgamation materially to reduce the staff. If the present dividends were increased, even after a diminution of price, the agitation to which the Companies have long been exposed would probably become more violent. It is difficult to understand how the terms of purchase could be settled beforehand if the dividends which might be earned were uncertain.

It is, as Sir C. ADDERLEY says, improbable that any large increase in the value of the property, and therefore in the consideration to be hereafter paid for it, will be sanctioned by Parliament; and yet the possible purchaser would be in no way injured by any increase in the purchase-money, provided it only represented the additional value of the property. It is evident that a dividend of 12 or 9 per cent. in the place of 10 or 7 per cent. would increase the value of the property of the Gas Companies; and they would be grievously injured if they were compelled to sell their undertaking at a sacrifice of income. It might indeed be possible to enact prospectively that a specified public body should be empowered to purchase the property at any time on the basis of the dividend which might have been earned during a certain period; but as the option would probably be exercised as soon as the dividend exceeded the present limit, the Companies would have no object in saving expense or in acquiring additional custom. If a change is required, or if it is conducive to the public interest, there can be no sufficient reason for delaying it. It is indeed doubtful whether the consumers would derive any advantage from a transfer of the power of supply; but at present they are assured by agitators that they have reason to complain, and, on the other hand, the shareholders are disquieted by periodical attacks on their property. It would, on the

whole, be desirable to complete the legislation of former years by securing to the proprietors their legal dividends and relieving them from the duty of managing the gas supply. The Corporation and the Metropolitan Board of Works would lose nothing by a purchase, and it is barely possible that the consumers might ultimately gain.

#### SCOTLAND AND CHURCH ESTABLISHMENTS.

THE meeting of the Commission of the Free Church General Assembly disposes of one of the arguments used last Session against the Scotch Church Patronage Bill. It was said, notably by Mr. GLADSTONE, that the Bill was faulty because it made no overtures to the Presbyterian communions outside the Established Church. The Free Church especially had seceded rather than submit to the law which it was proposed to alter, and if, after an interval of thirty years, the cause of this secession was to be removed, it was only decent that something should be done at the same time towards undoing a result so much to be regretted. It is now evident that, if the Church Patronage Bill had been made to depend upon any willingness on the part of the Free Church to be reunited to the Established Church, it would never have become law. On Wednesday the Commission, by 116 votes against 33, adopted a Resolution which is absolutely inconsistent with the principle of religious establishments as it has been understood in recent times. It is true that the Resolution makes the Free Church maintain steadfastly "the duty of a national recognition and promotion of Scriptural truth." But it altogether disavows the notion that, in return for this recognition and promotion, the State is to exercise any control over the Church. To hold that the Church is bound to obey the directions of the civil court relating to the civil rights of her members or to the statutory duties of the ecclesiastical authorities is to encroach upon the Scriptural liberty of Christians. Consequently the State is to give all and to receive nothing. It is to spend its substance in recognizing and promoting Scriptural truth, but if it so much as hints that a Church which consents to take its money is bound to obey its laws, it is warned off the holy ground, and forbidden to interfere with the Church's "peculiar and incumbent duties." Nothing in the nature of a Church Establishment is possible on such a basis as this. A community composed of men of all creeds does not set up a State religion because it desires a national recognition of Scriptural truth. It does so because there are many advantages in placing a matter of so much importance as religion under the control and supervision for certain purposes of the Civil Courts. If this control is to be repudiated by the authorities of the religious body which is distinguished by special privileges, there are but two possible courses for the State to take. It may enforce the supremacy of its own courts, or it may disestablish the Church which denies this supremacy. Supposing that the Free Church were now established by law, one or other of these courses would certainly have to be taken. The Resolution of the Commission of the General Assembly asserts that when Scriptural truth is subsidized by the State, no control must be exercised over its ministers by the law courts even in matters relating to civil rights or statutory duties. This is a pretension which would be incompatible with the retention of the position of an Established Church, and it is equally fatal to any proposal for a restoration to that position. The Resolution goes on to declare, with much consistency, that the Patronage Act, instead of rejecting the control of the temporal courts in temporal matters, tends rather to confirm it; and on this ground it denounces the existing connexion between Church and State in Scotland as unscriptural and inequitable. "Consequently its termination is an essential preliminary towards a beneficial readjustment of Scottish ecclesiastical arrangements." It follows from this that, if any proposal for bringing back the Free Church into the fold of the Establishment had been incorporated into the Church Patronage Bill, the Government would have had its offers flung back in its face. It was necessary that the measure should stand on its own merits, and be known to be, as it was, a mere Bill for effecting a particular change in the law relating to the Established Church.

It must be admitted, however, that, though the attitude of the Free Church invalidates this particular objection to the Patronage Act, it raises doubts as to the wisdom of passing any Act on the subject. The text of the Resolu-



tion and the speech in which its adoption was moved point unmistakably to a more or less active agitation in favour of disestablishment on the part of the Free Church. Dr. RAINY distinctly said that it was time for the members of the Free Church to make it clear which way their faces were set. Dr. BEGG, who opposed the Resolution, did so on the ground that its adoption would commit the Commission to a crusade against the Established Church. The Resolution was not passed, therefore, in ignorance of its true character. Its nature and operation were made abundantly clear to the Commission, both by those who liked it and by those who disliked it. Yet, after all this, the division showed a majority of more than three to one in its favour. It may be some time before the Free Church gives any practical effect to the decision of its representatives, but when once religious bodies take to making it clear which way their faces are set upon any question, they are apt to quicken their pace very soon after they have begun moving. The Free Church is strong in numbers, in influence, and in zeal, and the last words of the Resolution indicate a determination to summon the United Presbyterians to make common cause with them. Hitherto it has been supposed that the United Presbyterians are more hostile to the Established Church than the Free Church is, and if this relation between the two bodies is maintained, the crusade which the minority of the Commission deprecate will be organized without much delay. The Scotch Establishment stands in a different position from that in which the English Establishment stands. It is not the Church, it is known not to be the Church, of more than a minority of the people of Scotland. Whenever the Free Church and the United Presbyterians choose to unite their forces, they can largely outnumber it. It is probable, at all events in the first instance, that a proposal to disestablish the Church of Scotland would not be left to be settled, as most Scotch questions are settled, by the votes of the Scotch members. It would be resisted by the whole Conservative party in Parliament, irrespectively of nationality or creed. But it is difficult to believe that, if a majority of Scotchmen made up their minds that Presbyterianism after the manner of the Established Church should enjoy no more privileges than Presbyterianism after any other fashion, they would be very long in getting their own way.

There seems to be a sort of fatality attending Conservative Governments in their dealing with ecclesiastical questions. Here is a reasonable and Liberal measure, designed to widen the basis of the Established Church and to give her a stronger hold upon the Scottish people, which threatens by way of result to create a new and formidable outcry against the very institution which the authors of the Bill wish to protect and strengthen. It would not be difficult to suggest a parallel in the case of the Church of England. The fact is that a Conservative Government is to an Established Church what a new and friendly landlord sometimes is to the tenant of an old house. For many years, perhaps, the tenant has tried in vain to get any repairs done, but except that there is a hole or two in the roof, that the walls show some cracks, and that the foundation has a slight tendency to settle, the house has served his purpose fairly well. By and by there comes in a fresh landlord, who has something of the new broom in his composition, and who is perfectly willing to do anything in the way of repairs that his tenant can reasonably ask for. The occupier of the house is delighted, builders are called in, plans and estimates are prepared, and the workmen are put on without the loss of a moment. For a little time all goes well, but there comes a day when the landlord comes to see the tenant, and tells him, after much beating about the bush, that the more the workmen have done the more they have found to do, that the walls cannot be touched without bringing down the roof, that the foundations cannot be strengthened without peril to the walls, and that he has come to the conclusion that it will save money in the end to pull down the house altogether. The present Government are as yet in an early stage of this process. They have succeeded to power in the character of friends of the Church Establishment, and what can be more natural than that they should justify their reputation by removing abuses and supplying defects? The time is yet to come when they will find out that what looks like a mere unsightly block of wood may prove to be the beam on which all the timbers of the house depend. There is no putting new cloth into old garments. Established Churches that have gone on without material change for centuries cannot

be altered and refaced without being in danger of coming down altogether. There is much wisdom in the warning which Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN has just given in his speech at Deal, and it is to be hoped that it will be seriously considered. If the Ministry do not promptly recognize the wisdom of letting things alone, they are likely to have the lesson impressed on them by a revival of ecclesiastical agitations which they may find it hard either to appease or to guide.

#### RECRUITING.

SOME political cynic observed that he never felt certain of the truth of any statement until he saw it officially contradicted. The newspapers have this week contained two communications from high authority which the public seem disposed to accept in the same sense as they did the celebrated declaration that certain clauses in the Endowed Schools Act Amendment Bill were among those things which no Prime Minister could understand. One of these officially authorized statements was, that "the establishment of the army has been complete during the year, and the recruits, though young, are of a good stamp, and more than meet the requirements of the recruiters as regards standard." This may be literally true, and yet it would be far from supporting the more general statement which precedes it, that recruiting is satisfactory. Assume for the moment the "good stamp," and take it that the only fault of the recruits is that of youth, which time and good food and training will correct. The very gist of the warnings which have proceeded from every experienced officer who has written on this subject is that, under our present system, these young recruits will have no opportunity to grow into mature soldiers. Those who are old enough to remember the Crimean war will not disregard the lesson which it conveys. The army which fought at Alma and Inkermann was as fine an army as ever stepped. Sir JOHN BURGOYNE, who was not a boastful man, has recorded the admissions of French officers that their army could not have done what ours did. But that army perished by sword, sickness, and privation, and we have never had another like it. When our men had fallen before Sebastopol, we sent boys to take their places, and the result was such as might have been expected. One regiment, consisting chiefly of recruits, "though young, of a good stamp," was sent to the Crimea by way of reinforcement to the main army, and almost the whole perished. The operations of 1855, however we may view them, are scarcely matter of exultation; and it is at least possible that the failure at the Redan was partly due to the rawness of the troops engaged. In no other serious business should we set a boy to do a man's work, and even the great NAPOLEON failed when he attempted this in war. It may be true that he gained victories with boys, but he did not prevail on the whole campaign; and besides he was a general on whom soldiers might depend, whereas British generals are apt to depend upon their soldiers. This country is bound by treaties under which it might become necessary to send and to keep an army on the Continent, and this, as matters stand, could not be done. There are at most a few thousand men of the "stamp" of those that fought at Inkermann, and when these are expended, we must fall back upon recruits whose only fault we may admit would be youth and inexperience. We should enlist boys at vast expense, and send them abroad to die. No statements on authority can prevent experienced officers from drawing conclusions from what they see, or rather do not see, in the existing army; and if we could deceive ourselves, we could not deceive our neighbours. German and French journalists sometimes comment on the communications of authority to English newspapers, and it would be interesting to learn what they think of this particular utterance of the oracle. Assume that "the establishment of the army has been complete during the year," still the question remains whether that establishment is adequate to the necessities of the case, and upon this the oracle is silent. It is better to know the truth, however unpleasant, and we content ourselves with saying that, if there be any army of men in the country, we should like to see it. The utmost that can be reasonably inferred from the statement of authority is that the recruits of this year are rather better samples than those of last year, whose "stamp" largely was, or ought to have been, the letter "D." The mind of the Inspector of

Military Prisons was lately exercised on the question, What is the use of reclaiming a deserter whose delicate frame cannot support hard labour? It was perhaps a hasty generalization to infer from this officer's Report that the bulk of recruits had neither health nor honesty. We are now informed on authority that they "more than meet the requirements of the recruiters as regards standard," but unfortunately a boy's perpendicular measurement affords no test either of his principles or constitution. There is further the vague assurance that these recruits are of a "good stamp," though young, and it is added that they have been raised without any unusual exertions. If we asked whether unusual exertions had been required to keep our recruits when we had got them, the answer might perhaps be unsatisfactory.

But, whatever may be the precise meaning of this official communication, there is to be set against it "the universal testimony of every officer one meets from the highest to the lowest." Colonel ANSON, writing in the *Times* on the very day on which the statement by authority appeared, uses these words, and adds that that testimony is to the effect that the quality of our recruits has sensibly deteriorated; that insubordination is increasing, and dissatisfaction exists to an extent unknown in former days; that the class of men we now obtain creates an utterly untrustworthy reserve, and in case of need we should not be able to lay our hands on ten per cent. of them; and that, as in 1876 some 25,000 men will be able to claim their discharge, we must go from bad to worse to supply their place. The controversy which has arisen between Colonel ANSON and the *Times* would be amusing if the subject of it were not so vitally important. The apologists for the system or no-system which exists complain of Colonel ANSON's declaration that it is "beneath contempt," and insist that it cannot be judged until the year 1876 arrives. Perhaps we may have an army in that year, and perhaps we may not. Colonel ANSON is certain that we shall not, and his opponents are not very certain that we shall. He mentions one officer as an exception to the general consent of experienced opinion, and that officer likes to get boys because he can train them as he pleases, "forgetting that, if short service were really adopted, he would not have an able-bodied man in his regiment." It is probably in reference to this and similar passages in Colonel ANSON's letters that the *Times* observes that the public know how to discount the grumbling which is a privilege of the service. If the public do know this, they are wiser than we take them to be. To us the grumbling appears general and only too reasonable. All that we see and hear points to the opposite conclusion to that to which the *Times* would lead us. There is of course the "authorized paragraph" already discussed. The *Times* founds an article on it, and *ex nihilo nihil fit*. It would not be worth while to criticize these articles if they were not, so far as we know, the only considerable exception to the general chorus of complaint. We examine them to see what can be said to quiet the public mind, and the result is seriously alarming. The Inspector-General of Recruiting is quoted by the *Times* as saying that "on the whole a satisfactory number of eligible recruits are being obtained," though it remains to be proved whether the number will increase sufficiently to supply the want which will be created when the short-service men begin to be draughted into the Reserve. This, being translated out of official language into plain English, comes to what we have already said, that perhaps the country may have an army in 1876 and perhaps it may not. If this be "on the whole" satisfactory to the Inspector-General, he must be a comfortable officer to be under. "It remains to be proved," probably, whether the country could lay hand on the men who had gone into this Reserve. The only thing certain is that they will have gone out of the army. The *Times* tells us that this opinion of the Inspector-General is founded on "full returns from the whole army," and we may be sure that the returns are full, although the regiments may be undermanned or the men undersized. If a country could be saved by any application of pens and paper, Britain might defy the world. Colonel ANSON has put the matter shortly, and it is to be feared truly, thus:—"We do not pay the market price, and we do not get men; but we pay an inferior price for an inferior article, which would be useless in time of war." The only answer that the *Times* suggests to this disquieting statement is a reference to the Report of the Inspector-General of Recruiting, and to the "authorized

"paragraph" of last Wednesday, and this is no answer at all. The recruit, "though young, of a good stamp," would be useless in time of war, and even if we get the number that is wanted now, it is very doubtful whether we shall get the number that will be wanted two years hence. It is easy to realize Colonel ANSON's meaning by supposing that the duties of the Guards in London were undertaken by these recruits, "though young, of a good stamp." We know that they would be deficient in the qualities necessary to deal with a London mob, and yet we would match them against a foreign army. If boys could do the work of men, Lord CARDWELL was as competent as anybody to arrange how they should do it. But it is idle to plead for further trial of a plan which is manifestly inadequate. No plan can evade the necessity of choosing between largely increased estimates and compulsory service. "To this compulsion we must come at last."

#### FURTHER REPLIES TO MR. GLADSTONE.

IF Mr. Gladstone's Expostulation has produced no other effect, it has at least brought out to the surface the wide division of opinion among Roman Catholics as to the nature and binding force of the Vatican Decrees. While Mgr. Capel insists that all who reject them "make shipwreck of the faith, and *ipso facto* separate themselves from the communion of the Church," the correspondence in the *Times* during the last fortnight abundantly illustrates the statement of "A Roman Catholic" on Wednesday last, that there are many Catholics who, on Mgr. Capel's hypothesis, have, like himself and Lord Camoys, "*ipso facto* separated themselves from the Church," while they continue in the regular practice of their religious duties in common with their infallibilist coreligionists, "treating the new dogma as a dead letter, and considering themselves quite as orthodox as the Pope himself." The fact, indeed, was tolerably notorious before, but it had not been so prominently obtruded on the notice at least of the Protestant public. We may add that Italian ecclesiastics, and even prelates in Rome itself, do not scruple, in conversation with each other and with Protestants, to speak of the Vatican dogmas as not being "*de fide*," because the Council is only adjourned, and is not over; and no doubt all ecclesiastical precedent is in favour of their view. Meanwhile the net result of the controversy evoked by Mr. Gladstone has thus far been very decidedly to confirm the opinion we expressed last week, that while, on the one hand, no practical ground for the publication of the pamphlet has been established—in other words, no reason has been shown for doubting the loyalty and patriotism of the English Catholic body—all attempts to answer the theoretical argument of the writer only tend to prove more clearly that it is unanswerable. Speaking broadly—for there are exceptions on both sides to be noted presently—Mr. Gladstone's clerical critics have chiefly addressed themselves to the latter point, and have conspicuously failed; his lay commentators, beginning with Lord Acton, have convincingly proved the former, which Mr. Gladstone himself did not profess to doubt. Certainly, if it is important to remember that Pius V. excommunicated and deposed Queen Elizabeth, and even commissioned an assassin to murder her, there is more practical significance in the fact, of which Mr. Stourton reminds us, that the Armada, blessed and partly equipped by one of his successors for her destruction, was defeated by a fleet under command of the Roman Catholic Lord Howard of Effingham, while the Catholic nobility generally armed their tenants, and many of the gentry volunteered to serve as privates against the common foe. It is true that Sixtus V., who had a sincere admiration for Elizabeth and detested Philip II. and his policy, had been constrained sorely against his will to give a tardy sanction to the enterprise, but this could not be known in England at the time, while his official approval was matter of public notoriety. And a good deal of light is thrown on the present attitude of English Roman Catholics, as loyal and contented subjects, by Canon Oakley, who does not, like his Archbishop and Mgr. Capel, mount the high horse, but addresses his letter to Mr. Gladstone directly, as an old friend, and writes, as indeed he always does, with perfect temper, good feeling, and good taste. Nor have we much fault to find with his studiously moderate interpretation of the Syllabus, except that it is only his interpretation; and even he, if we rightly understand him, feels bound to regard toleration of heresy as "abstractedly opposed to the Catholic theory," though he has no desire to restore the practice of persecution. But he is hardly more happy than his brother clerics, as will presently appear, in grappling with Mr. Gladstone's argument on the real nature and force of the Vatican Decrees.

Why Mgr. Capel should have been commissioned to take up the cudgels in reply to Lord Acton and Lord Camoys is not obvious, unless Archbishop Manning shrank from pronouncing an explicit censure on those "excellent peers" in his own person; though he did not hesitate to go far out of his way to hurl an angry and irrelevant charge, which turns out also to be a wholly unfounded one, at the head of Dr. Dollinger. At all events, Mgr. Capel, though his language is so rash and unguarded as to draw on him a rebuke even from Sir G. Bowyer, adds little or nothing beyond personal comments to what had been said the week before by the Arch-



bishop, unless we are to reckon his implied repudiation of the subtle distinction which infallibilists have been fond of drawing, between the "personal" and "official" infallibility of the Pope, as a fresh contribution to the discussion. We have pointed out ourselves before now that it is a distinction without a difference, and Mgr. Capel evidently agrees with us. As to Lord Acton's "atrocious charges against the Holy See," or rather against several Popes, the acts charged are no doubt atrocious enough, but the Rector of a University ought to have known that many of them are familiar to every educated man, and that few living Englishmen are better able to give "the authorities" for any historical facts they may allege than Lord Acton. And, as he called his letter to the *Times* a "preliminary" answer, we presume that he intends to do so. It so happened that the same paper which contained Lord Camoys's letter contained also a second letter of Dr. Manning's, reprinted from the *New York Herald*, which is more defiantly outspoken than the first. For the Archbishop commits himself to the startling paradox—which, by the way, is implicitly contradicted by Mgr. Capel—that Papal infallibility was equally "a doctrine of Divine Faith before the Vatican Council," and "therefore the position of Catholics in respect to civil allegiance, since the Council, is precisely what it was before it." The conclusion is logical enough, but what is to be said of the premiss? If Papal infallibility was an article of faith before the Council, it is rather strange that nobody but Dr. Manning should have known it, or should even seem to know it now. Mgr. Capel states just the contrary; Lord Camoys, Mr. Henry Petre, and Mr. Stourton, names representing three of the oldest Roman Catholic families in England, agree in asserting that they were educated in a different belief, and Mr. Petre is careful to explain that his anti-infallibilist teachers were "the staunchest and most learned bulwarks of the Church"—namely, the Jesuits. To which we may add, without dwelling here on the well-known teaching of Bossuet and the great Church in whose name he spoke, that fifty years ago the entire Roman Catholic hierarchy of England and Ireland, under the distinguished leadership of men like Archbishop Murray and Bishop Doyle, solemnly repudiated this "doctrine of Divine Faith," which is moreover characterized as "a Protestant Invention" in Keenan's *Controversial Catechism*—a work widely circulated under the highest ecclesiastical sanction in England and America, and which has only been adapted to the new state of belief since the Vatican Council by the simple expedient of cancelling the page which contained this statement, and reprinting it with the obnoxious Question and Answer omitted. We must leave Dr. Manning to settle his difference with these high authorities, and meanwhile, until he has done so, his proof of the unchanged nature of the civil allegiance of Catholics falls to the ground. Canon Oakley, who argues that the change from an infallible Church to an infallible Pope is of no practical consequence, sufficiently refutes himself when he insists on the "obvious convenience" of the new régime, because the Pope is always on the spot, whereas General Councils are events of rare occurrence, and, as he broadly hints, may be altogether dispensed with for the future. It may be an advantage to transform a constitutional into an absolute monarchy, but the change, whether for better or worse, is nothing short of a revolution. The mention of General Councils reminds us of Mr. Stourton's letter in last Tuesday's *Times*. We have nothing to say against his vindication of Catholic loyalty, or his estimate, which is fair enough, of the character and reign of "Bloody Mary." But he has had the singular indiscretion, alone of Mr. Gladstone's Roman Catholic critics, to raise the question of the moral claims of the Vatican Council as compared with former assemblies held to represent the universal Church. We must confess that we read the following wonderful sentence two or three times over before we could believe that our eyes had not deceived us:—"Never has the slightest suspicion of informality or absence of freedom in debate been raised against the Council of the Vatican." It was open of course to Mr. Stourton to maintain that such suspicions are unfounded, but the statement he has actually made is only intelligible on the supposition that for the last five years he has shared the repose of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus, till Mr. Gladstone's trumpet-call roused him suddenly from his slumbers. Is it possible he can be unaware that these are precisely the two charges which have been reiterated *usque ad nauseam* against the Vatican Council from every side, by anticipation, during its sessions, and since its adjournment? Has he never heard, for instance, of *Janus*, or of the *Letters of Quirinus*, both the works of Roman Catholics, or of the host of adverse pamphlets, chiefly emanating from ecclesiastics and members of the Council, published during 1870, or of the successive official protests presented during the Council, signed by nearly all the German and many of the French Bishops, and complaining expressly of the "informality" of its regulations and the violent interferences with "freedom in debate," or of the parting shot fired off by Archbishop Darboy before leaving Rome when the great coup had been achieved, *La Dernière Heure du Concile*? We are bound to believe that he knows none of these things, but he would certainly have been wiser to abstain from meddling with a question of all the details of which he is so profoundly ignorant.

We have already avowed our entire concurrence in the trust, expressed alike by the Ultramontane Lord Herries and the Liberal Lord Acton, in the firm and unchanged loyalty of their coreligionists as English citizens. But then we cannot escape the conclusion which Archbishop Manning is so anxious to disclaim, that "they are good citizens because they are at variance with

the Catholic Church," as represented by the Vatican Council. We do not believe that the Vatican Decrees will, in fact, make them one whit less loyal citizens, but to say that there is nothing in the claims authenticated by those Decrees to affect their civil allegiance is something beyond a paradox. To adopt Mr. Petre's very guarded statement, "the claims of the Vatican (that is of the Pope) to supreme and infallible authority over all things pertaining to faith and morals, the limits of which the Vatican alone is to decide, embrace so vast and immense a range, entering into every relation and branch of human life, that we may easily contemplate the power of the Church clashing with the civil authority." Curiously enough the current number of the *Dublin Review*, published just a month before Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet, supplies a striking illustration of the authority exercised in purely civil matters by the Pope in our own day, to which we may call the attention of Sir G. Bowyer, who denies the right of the ecclesiastical power to interfere in questions of civil government. We do not refer to the direct assertion of the deposing power, which the editor of the *Dublin Review* has somewhat qualified in a letter addressed to the *Tablet* since the appearance of Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet, but to passages of much greater practical interest which he has said nothing to modify or retract, though we may just observe in passing that we cannot comprehend how any one who accepts the Syllabus as infallible can question the deposing power without heresy. In an article directed against the pretensions of the Count of Chambord, the reviewer, whom we gather from the letter mentioned above to be the editor himself, constructs an elaborate and forcible refutation of the theory of divine right, or, as he prefers rather quaintly to term it, "hereditism." His argument is quite strong enough to stand by itself, but he has nevertheless thought it necessary to clinch it by what he evidently, and perhaps rightly, assumes will be with his readers, as with himself, the turning-point of the whole controversy. We have taken the liberty of inserting a few italics. "It is to the Holy See of course that the eyes of a Catholic naturally turn, where there is a critical and pervasive question of morals to be solved." In morals, it will be remembered, the Pope has been declared to be infallible. And accordingly the act of Pius VII. in crowning Napoleon is appealed to as next door to "an *ex cathedra* decision against hereditism." It finally disposed, for all good Catholics, of the hereditary pretensions of the Bourbons. However, the Bourbons were afterwards restored, and were again overthrown by the July Revolution of 1830, when Louis Philippe was called to the throne of France. And thus an anxious question was raised as to the lawfulness of the revolutionary Government. It was again decided by the Pope. "By the fact of directing Catholics to take the new oath of allegiance he (Pius VIII.) declared that the new Government was the *de jure* Sovereign of France; the Sovereign to which all Frenchmen were bound to pay allegiance, under penalty of incurring the severe sentence pronounced by Scripture and the Church on those who rebel against existing powers." It is true that in this case the Pope decided in accordance with modern sentiment and sound sense; but he might have decided the other way, and it would, as the reviewer quite consistently implies, have been equally the duty of all good Catholics to obey him. It was a strictly political question, but it comes under the comprehensive head of morals, and therefore within the sphere of infallibility.

We see no way out of this dilemma except by adopting some such arbitrary definition of "*ex cathedra* decisions" as that recently put forward by Dr. Newman, which by limiting them to decrees promulgated "with solemnities parallel to those of a General Council," makes a clean sweep of all former Papal pronouncements except one. Mr. Gladstone has indeed justly styled Dr. Newman "the greatest living theologian of the Roman Catholic Church," but, if Lord Acton cannot be accepted as the "representative of Catholic thought or spokesman of the Catholic laity," as little can Dr. Newman be considered the representative or spokesman of Catholic divines. There are at least a dozen other interpretations of "*ex cathedra*" current among them, all of which are more widely received than his, and any one of which of course it rests with the infallible Pope to select and authenticate, whenever he pleases, as alone adequate or permissible. It is very unlikely, as Lord Camoys observes, that Pius IX. will emulate the example of Pius V. and excommunicate or depose Queen Victoria, but still "there is no telling what edict might be issued by the author of the Syllabus," or his successors. And it is quite certain that, whatever edict they might choose to issue, every infallibilist would be bound in conscience to obey it. When the Ultramontane "Catholic Union" declares in the same breath its cordial acceptance of the Vatican Decrees and its unchanged attitude in regard to the civil power, it only confirms what we had always believed, that the loyalty of English Ultramontanes is sounder than their logic.

#### METRICAL TESTS.

THE new Shakspeare Society has lately produced the first fruits of its labours in a volume of *Transactions* containing some excellent criticism and many good promises of future results. One of its most conspicuous features is the application of certain mechanical tests by which it is thought that much greater accuracy may be obtained in some critical inquiries. Enthusiasts like Mr. Fleay appear to hold that the change amounts to substituting a quantitative for a merely qualitative analysis, and, in short, that

criticism conducted by such methods will have some genuine claims to scientific accuracy. Dr. Newman, in the *Grammar of Assent*, draws an illustration with his usual felicity from the case of Shakspearian criticism. He shows how much delicate perception is required before a trustworthy opinion can be formed as to the authenticity of proposed emendations, and how little can be done by applying the coarse tests of formal syllogisms. The hope of some of our new critics appears to be that this difficulty will disappear, and that in a large class of questions the necessity for a fine critical sense will be superseded. Little more will be wanted for settling some perplexing questions than a capacity for counting syllables. Every member of the fraternity who excited Pope's contempt—

Each wight who reads not and but scans and spells,  
Each word-catcher who lives on syllables—

will now have his day; and perhaps when the system has been carried into the allied arts, we shall find that the authenticity of pictures attributed to the old masters will no longer perplex the managers of the National Gallery. When Shakspeare's dramas can be judged by the help of simple scanning, we shall surely be able to decide upon Raffaele by a foot-rule, or at least by some new application of spectrum analysis.

We are very far from denying that this mechanical device has its utility when confined within proper limits. The facts which it brings to light have a real bearing upon important questions, though, when they are known, it requires almost as much judgment to use them as to arrive at conclusions without their help. Mr. Furnivall, who has himself turned them to good account, says very truly that the taste of a highly cultivated and trained reader must always supply the best test; and that counting can never supersede criticism. Making this reservation, however, it is easy to admit that the industry of such gentlemen as Mr. Fleay has provided much useful material.

One application of the test, for example, is to determine the date of Shakspeare's plays. The gradual change of his style led to certain definite external changes in his versification, such as the disuse of rhyme, and the more frequent use of double endings and "unstopt" lines. The change might be recognized in a general way, but there is an advantage in having definite arithmetical statements of results which cannot be due to the fancy of the writer. When Mr. Fleay tells us that there are over one thousand rhyming lines in *Love's Labour's Lost*, and none in the *Winter's Tale*, we have a definite fact dependent only upon the accuracy of Mr. Fleay's counting. When he proceeds to say that the plays can be arranged in four periods, discriminated by the proportion of rhymes employed in each, we may suppose that his argument is not quite conclusive; but when corroborated by other independent tests, it certainly affords a strong presumption, which cannot be so easily rebutted as the simple record of a general impression. The best instance, however, of the application of the method is given in the attempt to discriminate the parts contributed by Shakspeare to *Henry VIII.* and the *Two Noble Kinsmen*. It is satisfactory to worshippers of the greater poet to hear that two very able critics, Mr. Spedding and the late Mr. Hickson, have authorized us to attribute the inferior parts of *Henry VIII.* to Fletcher, and, on the other hand, have claimed the best parts of the *Two Noble Kinsmen* for Shakspeare. The arguments which led them to this conclusion are repeated in this volume; and though it may be premature to pronounce them unanswerable, it may safely be said that they establish a very strong case. Each writer gives an exhaustive discussion, taking into account the style, the general character of the poetry, and the peculiarities of the construction, as well as the more definite peculiarities of versification. Mr. Fleay and Mr. Furnivall then confirm the results by showing that in each case the parts assigned to Shakspeare and Fletcher respectively satisfy their mechanical tests. In the scenes ascribed to Shakspeare in the *Two Noble Kinsmen* there are over forty unstopt lines in every hundred, whilst in the scenes ascribed to Fletcher there are less than nineteen. Conversely, the number of lines with a redundant syllable is much greater in the Fletcher than in the Shakspeare scenes; the percentage of such lines being in the first case over forty-five, and in the second under twenty-nine. The only remark that we need make is that the tests are not entirely independent. The frequency of unstopt lines, for example, was one of the causes which led the first critics to identify certain scenes as belonging to Shakspeare, though they may have felt the result instead of analysing its cause. The case is not really strengthened when Mr. Furnivall assigns the precise numerical value of the argument. He is merely giving a more definite character to the reasoning. When an ordinary observer recognizes a particular handwriting, his judgment is determined by a vague and half-conscious observation of the very same characters which an expert describes in more mathematical language. He observes that one hand is more cramped than another, though he does not measure the size of the loops or the length of the tails of the letters. Mr. Spedding notices that the language of certain scenes is less confined by the mechanism of the verse; and Mr. Furnivall shows by actual counting that there are fewer pauses at the end of the lines. So far as this is the case they are both arguing from the same phenomenon, and should not be reckoned as independent witnesses. When, however, the reasoning is not pushed too far, and when several really independent tests bring out the same result, we may admit that an argument thus backed by reference to unquestionable figures acquires a great cumulative force, and may sometimes be conclusive.

In order to show what value should be attributed to such tests, it will be necessary to check them very carefully, not only by the results of higher criticism, but by such external evidence as can be obtained. The tests themselves must be tested. In the absence of external evidence we can only judge by the harmony of the results which they produce; and we need not say that the external evidence as to the dates of Shakspeare's plays is much less abundant than we could wish. We would suggest, therefore, that it would be worth while for some industrious members of the Society to apply a similar series of tests to some case where a complete check can be obtained, and see how far their conclusions will be satisfactory. We have had the curiosity to try such a plan on a small scale, with the results which we are about to give. It must be premised, however, that, as we cannot profess to be experts in the new method, and as we are still less inclined to boast of an industry comparable to Mr. Fleay's, our figures are given with a certain diffidence, and the investigation, if pushed further, might bring out a different result.

The most favourable subject for the experiment which we have tried is probably Mr. Tennyson. Few readers will dispute that, whatever his other qualities, he is the greatest living master of blank verse, we might probably add the greatest who has appeared since the days of Milton. No one has shown such perfect command of the instrument; and his poems have appeared at so wide intervals of time that we might fairly expect that some such change might be found in his versification as that which took place in Shakspeare's. We have taken ten of Mr. Tennyson's poems, pretty much at random, and will make the allowable hypothesis that this selection is placed before the Mr. Fleay of two or three centuries hence, and that he is required to arrange the poems in order of time, or to say whether they are all the work of one author. Perhaps at that period there might be a tradition that more than one poet had existed of the name of Tennyson, and it would naturally be a pleasing problem for the acute critics of that day to display their acuteness by splitting one man into two. Homer has been subdivided, and a modern author cannot claim to be exempt from the same fate. The only applicable test in this case is that of the stopt line, and we will give in each case the percentage of unstopt lines—that is, of lines where there is no pause at the end—which occurs in each of the poems. We find, then, that in the *Princess* there are 766 unstopt lines in a total of 2,725, or a percentage of 28 such lines. In the first book, however, the percentage is as low as 23.7, whilst in the fourth it rises to 32.6. We may add that we have omitted here and in the *Idyls* the peculiar lyrical blank verse of some of the songs. In *Aylmer's Field* 30 per cent. of 853 lines are unstopt; in the *Ulysses* 33 per cent. of 70 lines; in *Guinevere* 19 per cent. of 678 lines; in *Enoch Arden* 18.7 per cent. of 908 lines; in the *Morte d'Arthur* (in its earliest form) 20.6 per cent. of 354 lines; in the *Gardener's Daughter* 27.4 per cent. of 273 lines; in *Dora* 20.9 per cent. of 177 lines; in *Enid* 20.6 per cent. of 1,857 lines; and in *Lucretius* 31.7 per cent. of 280 lines. Starting from these figures, it may be at once observed that the poems fall into two classes, in one of which the proportion of unstopt lines is about 20 per cent., or 1 in 5, whilst in the other it is about 30 per cent., or 1 in 3.3. The difference, though not so great as that which divides Fletcher from Shakspeare in their joint work, is sufficiently marked to give a distinctive character to the verse. The acute critic might therefore identify the author of *Enid* and *Guinevere* with the author of the earlier *Morte d'Arthur*, where the proportion is identical with that in *Enid*; and would attribute to the same hand *Dora* and *Enoch Arden*. The *Gardener's Daughter*, *Ulysses*, *Aylmer's Field*, and *Lucretius* would, on the other hand, belong to the author of the *Princess*. The higher criticism would show that it was easy to detect a very different tone of sentiment in the two classes; and that a greater complexity of thought, corresponding to a more elaborate structure of sentence, distinguished the *Princess* from the Arthurian idyls. The resemblance, it might be argued, is great enough to indicate perhaps some family relation between the two Tennysons; but not to overpower the evidences of distinct authorship. If, on the other hand, it was admitted that the same hand had written both series, the difference would then correspond to different periods of the poet's development. An arrangement according to the test would give us the following order:—*Ulysses*, *Lucretius*, *Aylmer's Field*, the *Princess*, the *Gardener's Daughter*, *Dora*, *Enid*, the *Morte d'Arthur*, *Guinevere*, and *Enoch Arden*; or if, on the Shakspearian precedent, the simpler were supposed to precede the more complex structure, the order would be reversed. We need hardly point out that in either case the order would be entirely different from the actual order of publication; and that pieces which appeared in the earliest volume that contained blank verse would alternate in complete confusion with some of the poet's latest productions.

So far, then, it would seem that the result is purely nugatory, or, if anything, tends to discredit the efficacy of the method. It was not indeed to be expected that Mr. Tennyson's system of versification should go through a process of development analogous to that of Shakspeare's. All that we have proved, if our results are correct, is that Tennyson's change of manner does not lend itself to this particular mode of investigation. The varieties which he presents correspond to differences in the sentiment which he is expressing, and not to any progressive difference in the writer's system. When representing the passion of *Lucretius*, or writing with the comparative freedom of the *Princess*, his cadence is more broken and varied than when he adopts the rather constrained purism of the *Idyls*.



All that we appear to have shown is that the difference between these moods is capable of some sort of arithmetical expression, and thus a difference of which every one is sensible when reading can be made palpable to the senses by this rude kind of critical dissection. We can easily imagine cases in which this result would have some value; but it is also clear that it would be possible to press it into the service of very erroneous theories, and consequently that the method needs to be carefully checked by other faculties than the calculating

## BRESCIA.

THE last strictly Italian city of which we spoke was Como. A roundabout, but highly attractive, journey by lake and railway will lead us thence, without passing through mightier Milan, to another city with whose place in Italian and general history that of Como may be compared and contrasted. As a city, Brescia ranks far higher than Como; it does so even now; much more so did it in the days when it was looked on as a rival to Milan. And the direct part which Brescia has played in history has been incomparably more important than that which has been played by Como. If its wrongs were not made the pretext of such mighty movements as those which sprang out of the earlier and the later wrongs of Como, the doings and the sufferings of the city itself are far more prominent and important. Brescia played her part as an important member of the Lombard League, and her name and the effigies of her citizens were set up by grateful Milan over the gate which recorded her rebuilding, partly by Brescian hands, after her overthrow by the later patron of Como. Prominent as Brescia thus was in opposition to the claims of Frederick, she appears as no less prominent in withstanding the last of his successors whose Imperial claims were other than a mockery. The city stood a siege at the hands of Henry of Luxemburg, and if her own chief Tebaldo Brusati died by what some called the cruelty and some the justice of the Emperor, his loss was avenged by the death of Henry's own brother Waleran, in the struggle beneath her walls. In later times, when Brescia, like so many of her sister cities, had passed under the dominion of St. Mark, we find her the centre of the strongest resistance to the powers which leagued together to wipe out the wise aristocracy from among the ruling cities of the world. The name of Brescia may be familiar to many who have but vague ideas of Frederick of Swabia and Henry of Luxemburg, because there the knight "without fear and without reproach" gained himself the praise of superhuman virtue by not playing what amongst honest men would be called the part of a superhuman scoundrel. That Brescia fell from her old place was largely due to the havoc and massacre of her French conquerors in a warfare as unprovoked and inexcusable as any in which French conquerors ever engaged. The blood of Avogaro, shed at the bidding of Gaston of Foix, could more rightly cry for vengeance than the blood of Brusati shed at the bidding of Henry the Seventh. What was, from his own point of view, a deed of stern justice at the hands of the lawful King of Italy sinks into simple murder when it was done simply to glut the pride of an unprovoked invader.

Brescia then is a city which has lived a life in the very thick of Italian history, while Como has, so to speak, lived only on its outskirts. The contrast is marked in the position of the two cities. Both lie on the northern frontier of Italy, at the foot of her great mountain bulwark. But they look different ways. Como, in her valley, by her lake, looks northward, as if opening her arms to welcome the Teutonic King who comes to her relief. Brescia, not lying in an Alpine valley, but with her citadel perched on a spur of the Alps themselves, instead of turning away her eyes from Italy to the north, looks down upon nothing short of Italy herself. The view from the castle of Brescia is indeed a noble one. And it is not a mere noble view; it is a view on which the characteristic history of Italy is legibly written. It may almost remind us of the famous letter of Sulpicius to Cicero. With a single glance of the eye we look down on a crowd of cities, each of which once was an independent commonwealth, with its name and place in history. On one side are the spurs of the Alps on which we are standing, reminding us that there is a land beyond, from which Emperors came down to demand the crowns of Italy and of Rome. To the far east we get a glimpse of smaller hills on the extreme horizon, suggesting that the natural ramparts of Verona are not beyond our sight. But to the south the eye ranges over the boundless plain of Lombardy, spreading like a sea, with a tall tower here and there, like the mast of a solitary vessel. Each of those towers marks a city, a city which once ranked alongside of princes, cities making war and peace, and containing within their walls the full life of a nation. The map seems to show that one of them is the mighty tower of Piacenza, and that another is the yet mightier tower of Cremona, the fellow-worker of Brescia in the great work of restoring Milan. But we look out on even more than this. We have vividly brought home to us how near the great cities of Northern Italy lie to the Alpine barrier, the barrier which was so often found helpless to shelter them against the Northern invader. We think of all the conquerors who have crossed the mountains from Hannibal to our own day. And we go back to times earlier still, when the land which became the truest Italy was not yet Italy at all, when the Po was as truly a Gaulish river as the Seine. If the Alps themselves proved so feeble a barrier for the shelter of Italy, how far more feeble was the barrier which sheltered Etruria and Rome, when what is now Northern Italy

was still Gaul within the Alps! From such a point we may well run over the shifting fates of the land before us from Brennus to either Buonaparte. And, as our thoughts flit on beyond Po and Macra and Arno to the seven hills by the Tiber, we may feel thankful that the dominion of the last invader has become as much a thing of the past as the dominion of the earliest.

Yet, though the great historic view of Brescia lies to the south, it may be well for him who stands on that height to turn his eyes to the north also. There is an aspect in the history, if not of Brescia, yet of the most renowned man of Brescia, which makes us look alike northward and southward, which makes us span the space which lies between the Tiber and the Limmatt. If Como looks beyond the Alps for her own deliverer, Brescia too looks beyond the Alps, not for a deliverer for herself, but for a place of shelter from the citizen whom she sent forth to deliver others. In the life of the Brescian Arnold his native city seems like a halting-place between his city of refuge at Zürich and his city of glory and martyrdom at Rome. We need not be harsh on either Pope or Emperor, in whose eyes a republican reformer could hardly fail to bear the guise of a heretic and a traitor. On the heights of Brescia we feel, as we look Romeward, a regret that it was at Swabian and English hands that he met his doom. But, as we look northward, we may feel comfort that it was a Teutonic and Imperial city which sheltered the man who, if he took his memories for hopes, could yet call back for a moment the days when Rome had not to seek her master either in a German King or in an English Pontiff.

The view of the city itself on which we look down from the castle is hardly worthy of the general landscape of which it forms a part. Its look is indeed striking, but hardly more so than that of any city of decent antiquity must be when it is looked down on in such a way. But the view of Brescia does not send up any object on which the eye at once seizes as something specially to dwell on. There are towers and cupolas; but there is no tower or cupola which kindles any very strong desire for a further acquaintance. And, as we walk the streets, there are fewer attractive buildings, whether ecclesiastical or domestic, than in most Italian cities. Yet Brescia by no means lacks objects deserving study. Only the chief antiquities of the city lie somewhat hid, and have to be looked for. The most striking when we come near to it, though it necessarily makes no show in the general view, is the *duomo vecchio*, the old cathedral, the famous round church of Brescia. The new cathedral by its side is a building of no importance; but it is at least to the credit of its builders that they left the old one standing. Had the same discretion been shown in some other places, we should have many more monuments of early times than we have. But if the round church has not been destroyed, a vast deal of labour has been spent on the characteristic work of spoiling it. The upper round, the clerestory, has not been seriously meddled with, and it still keeps the majesty of its circular outline, having a far greater effect of spreading massiveness—the proper effect of a round building—than any of the round churches of England. But the lower range has been sadly tampered with, and the inside has suffered from the process which the English translation of Budeker calls "painting the pillars to resemble columns." This is not very clear to the English reader, but, as in some other English translations of German books, the meaning may be guessed by stopping to think what the German original must be. The round rests on massive square piers, in German *Pfeiler*, and the whole has been, like St. Vital at Ravenna, bedaubed to imitate Renaissance architecture. This makes the general look of the inside sadly disappointing. But the disappointment begins to vanish as soon as we make our way underground and see the spacious crypt, with the endless variety of its columns and capitals of all manner of forms, some of them clearly classical ones used up again. This crypt proves that the round church of Brescia had, as all our round English churches have at present, a choir projecting to the east, but the choir to which the crypt belonged has made way to a late building on a much larger scale. There is also in Brescia a Romanesque church of the basilican plan to match the round one, but this has emphatically to be looked for. Within the range of the extensive buildings which go by the common name of St. Julia—a suppressed monastery, now put, it would seem, to various uses military and municipal—are three churches. One of these, Santa Maria in Solario, a square Romanesque building with an octagon top, shows itself in the street, but, unlike the usual rule of Brescia, the inside, except the crypt, hardly fulfils the promise of the outside. In truth, a small building of this kind, where there can hardly be any columns, allows of but little scope for display within, unless, like the buildings of its class at Ravenna, it is covered with mosaics. Far more important than this is another of the same group, San Salvatore, attached at a lower level to the worthless church of St. Julia proper. Here, when we penetrate to it, we come to a genuine church of the basilican type, which to some travellers may chance to be their first specimen of that type. Two ranges of columns above and a crypt below exhibit the usual features of buildings of this class, columns with capitals of various kinds, classical and other, ranged as happened to be convenient. Every building of this kind has its interest, and to some it may happen to be the first foreshadowing of its more stately fellows at Ravenna, at Lucca, and at Rome.

But the chief attraction of Brescia is hardly to be found in its churches. Had it been left uninjured, the great *Brotto*, in much the same style as the smaller one at Como, and like that,

hard by the *duomo*, though not actually touching it, would doubtless have claimed the first place. And its historic interest is not small, as it was round this spot that the fight raged most fiercely when Brescia had thrown off the heavy bondage of the Gaul to return to the lighter yoke of the Serene Republic. But the building is sadly disfigured; its blocked windows merely peep through to show what they were. On the whole, the first place among the antiquities of Brescia must be given to the museum, formed out of an excavated temple. The remains of the building itself, the stately columns of its portico which still survive, are striking in themselves, and they supply one piece of detail which is interesting in the history of architectural forms. The columns do not form a continuous range, but the portico has projections in front. The angles have thus to be provided for, and they are provided for by forestalling, in the architecture of the days of Vespasian, the section of the mediæval clustered pillar. Within, in the restored triple *cella*, is a whole store of antiquities, classical and mediæval. The gem of the collection in an artistic point of view is doubtless the figure of Victory, of Greek workmanship; but more light is thrown on Brescian history by the long series of inscriptions ranging from the first Imperial days to Gratian and Theodosius, and by the other long series of architectural details, classical and Romanesque, from the destroyed buildings of the city. The library too is rich in treasures, though we cannot forbear the remark that almost too much liberality is shown in the ease with which strangers are allowed to examine them. Experience may perhaps have shown that only people with a praiseworthy object are likely to seek for them at all; otherwise an ill-disposed person might easily damage, or perhaps even carry off, some of the smaller objects. But there they are; precious manuscripts of various dates, jewelled crosses, carvings, and an object which, if we were right in our reading of it, is of surpassing interest. This is a consular diptych, bearing the name of Boetius. This is a relic indeed, though it would have had a more melancholy interest still, if it had been found at Pavia instead of at Brescia. At Ravenna we would fain not be reminded of the one crime of the reign of the prince under whom Rome and Italy were happy.

Such are a traveller's impressions of Brescia. It is a witness to the amazing historical wealth of the Italian cities that a place like this, which has so many memories and so much to show for them, can hardly, in an antiquarian point of view, claim a place above the third rank.

#### PLAIN COOKS.

**W**ANTED, an industrious, thrifty, sensible woman, who has some idea of cookery, who will do a little housework, clean her knives, and be content with the wages of a governess. The servants who now apply for such situations in middle-class households are for the most part wholly unfit for them. Sometimes they are kitchenmaids who have been under good cooks, but have been too lazy or too stupid to learn from them, and, being generally without any ambition to rise in their profession, they have abandoned all hope of ever earning high wages. Sometimes, again, they belong to a class of which the young or inexperienced housekeeper must beware. Its representative is usually an elderly woman of many places, who is destined to be in many more; indeed she adds to their number almost every month, for drink, or laziness, or both, will account for any frequency in her migrations. A third and more numerous class is that of the young woman who has been a maid-of-all-work. She has been ignorantly brought up, and her home training has been worse than none. She has seen waste when money and provisions were plenty, alternating with starvation, begging, and dishonesty when scarcity of work and drunkenness have made times hard. She has inhabited a crowded room where tidiness was impossible; her dress has consisted chiefly of rags, garnished with artificial flowers; her highest ideal of amusement has been a fair or a music-hall; and her only preparation for entering domestic service a few months at nominal wages in a lodging-house. There she has learnt little but peculation, and has been accustomed often to lie down at night in her clothes too weary to undress, and to rise in the morning and go about her work unwashed and uncombed. When the maid-of-all-work obtains a place as plain cook she assumes the reins of office with perfect self-satisfaction. She proceeds without any hesitation to waste and destroy the materials entrusted to her for conversion into food. It need hardly be observed that her success is complete. She keeps her milk and cream in the hot kitchen and wonders that they turn sour. She puts the butter into the same small cupboard with the cheese, and is surprised that the sauce which she sends to the dinner-table has an unpleasant taste. She will not be at the trouble of cleaning out the oven-flues, and cannot imagine why the paste will not rise. She leaves the fish upon the kitchen-table from the time it is brought until she is ready to cook it, and stands by with a look of innocence while the fishmonger is scolded for sending stale fish. When she lays a fire she crams it with bundles of wood so that it will not light, and supplements her bad architecture with whole boxes of matches and very long candle-ends. She stirs the kitchen fire every time she passes it, and keeps it blazing even when there is no cooking to be done, and when the family is dining out. If the heat makes her ill, she blames the poor accommodation of the house, and talks as if she had come from a palace to enter service. If she has a gas stove the taps are constantly turned on,

and as to lowering the lights in the passages or scullery such an idea never crosses her mind even in dreams. She will send up the eggs either raw or hard boiled rather than use your sand-glass. She will give you bread and milk with roast chicken rather than beat and flavour the mixture into bread sauce. She will make tea with tepid water, will send up spinach that looks like cabbage rather than put it through a sieve, and will peel the potatoes an inch thick to save the trouble of picking out their eyes.

Now really refined cooking is the result of practice and teaching. But, short of this, the genius which consists of "an infinite capacity for taking trouble" will do much for the production of food which shall be wholesome and palatable as well. This is exactly the quality deficient in an ordinary cook. Flavouring, frying, and making puff-paste are not to be learnt in a day, though common sense and the will to use it are enough for the preparation of an ordinary dinner. But the contemporary cook has only one recipe for every dish—namely, quantity and waste. She asks for a dozen eggs and a pint of cream for the simplest cabinet pudding, and prefers isinglass to gelatine only because it is more expensive. A whole pot of jam must be consumed to make a single tartlet. A joint in the kitchen and another in the parlour is the allowance she prescribes for every day. She never keeps gravy; it is mean to boil down bones and scraps. If gravy is wanted, gravy beef should be ordered. The rind should be cut off the bacon at least an inch thick, and a crock of broken bread must always be kept to get mouldy for the honour of the house. Frying can only be done in lard in any respectable kitchen, and what number of oysters are required for a single patty we do not venture to estimate. Untidiness, too, the constant companion of wastefulness, she has reduced to a science. Her cupboards are an alarming mixture of scraps, sauces, forgotten whites of eggs, and pots of dripping, together with raisins and cornflour, furniture-polish and blacklead.

Her destruction of articles of food is well matched by her treatment of the crockery and kitchen utensils in her charge. She warns the best china dinner-plates to a white heat. The dishes she puts into the oven, until their surface resembles that of the crackle porcelain admired by collectors. If they are adorned with arms or monograms in colour and gilding, she early discovers the efficacy of strong soda and soft soap in the removal of such vanities. A few dexterous movements will chip the edges on a stone sink, and she thinks it well to remove such excrescences as the handles of dishes or the tops of their covers; her reasons for these measures may be sanitary, as handles only form recesses for grease and dust, and it is impossible to clean them without trouble. Pudding basins she consumes in large numbers, and uses butter-boats to feed the cat. The dishes she sends to table invariably soil the cloth, and are so full of gravy that they often spill on the way upstairs. The covers are smeared with greasy finger-marks, and it is well if the outside only is dirty. The kitchen is her fortress; from it drawing-room company is carefully and jealously excluded. In all families the children look upon the kitchen as a paradise of dainty devices. In some they are never allowed to enter it; but in others the little missy is sometimes privileged to make a bit of paste into ducks and drakes, or to knead some dough into a cake for the doll's birthday. Such frivolities a modern cook sternly represses. She supposes the young ladies will want to make puddings next or to come down and try recipes out of "them rubbishy books." She has no notion of encouraging such pranks. A favour has to be made of leave to use her bowls and spoons, and the young officer just home from his regiment dare not venture into the sacred precinct to concoct a real Indian curry or a Mulligatawny pillaw unless he has first ascertained that cook is in a good humour. Even the lady of the house is informed very plainly that after her morning visit she is not expected to disturb the quiet of the lower regions. The trap is always missing from the kitchen sink, and things run into the drain which should never go there; the valve itself disappears among the ashes, and is carried away by the dust-cart, together with the stoppers of sauce bottles, the heads of pepper-casters, jam-pots, and half-burnt coals. Indeed one might think that the cook had a personal interest in the dustman, and wished to bestow as many useful articles upon him as possible; or perhaps her benevolent feelings are stirred by some tale of the poor sorters in the cinder yards to whom these things are perquisites, and she would be charitable by proxy. She has a kind heart for all sorts of tramps, and frequently has her fortune told. The woman whose babies seem endowed with a perpetual youth, the man who sells pencils, the various folk who eke out a precarious livelihood by hawking mittens, combs, and pen-wipers, find in her a sympathetic patron, and draw from her large supplies of her master's bread and meat. A carrier, whose pony was more sleek and well fed than carriers' ponies often are, confessed on one occasion that he obtained from the tramps in his neighbourhood their stores of crusts at one shilling a peck:—"Sometimes I am almost inclined to pick out the pieces of cheese and meat, but Jack here eats it all up as sweet as can be, and his coat's like satin."

Her personal habits accord with her domestic and social qualities. She labours under a chronic hydrophobia, for though her thirst is unquenchable she carefully avoids cold water. Copious draughts of beer, occasionally varied in the afternoon with tea, and in the evening with gin, assist her in her work and support her exhausted frame. Personal ablutions she does not affect, but wipes her hands usually on the tablecloth, or whatever else is within her reach. Pudding-cloths are convenient for the purpose, and become so saturated with various animal oils, butter, fat, and lard, that they are devoured by the mice which, with flies, kittens, and



blackbeetles, constitute the *fauna* of the kitchen. A small piece of broken looking-glass on the dresser enables her now and then to smooth her hair, the usual appearance of which suggests the occasional but scanty use of the blacking-brush. The chief efforts of her toilet upon week-days are made for the advent of the butcher's boy, but she is not given to wasting time in the decoration of her form. All her powers in this line are reserved for Sunday, when she turns out, as she confidently believes, quite the lady, her whole earnings being spent on the display, for she never saves out of her wages, and seems to live in the quiet expectation of a handsome legacy or a wealthy husband. Perhaps it is to this end that the hair, so untidy on Saturday, is now braided into shining rolls; the hands, yesterday so grimy, are covered with green leather gloves; the feet, which all the week have only worn slippers, are encased in tight and high-heeled boots, decorated with arabesques; and, to her great delight, she fondly thinks there is nothing of the cook about her. Those who have to submit to her professional shortcomings may think there is no more of the cook about her on week-days. She despises her occupation, and can hardly therefore be expected to succeed in it. She looks upon her mistress as an unreasonable being, full of whims and fancies, which it is her painful duty to evade and thwart as often as possible. She explains to her young man, for cooks are never without sweet-hearts, that her people are a mean lot, that they buy from the Civil Service, make soup of distracted meat, and eat irritated bread, and that she means to give warning immediately.

#### LAITY v. CLERGY.

THE division of Englishmen into clergy and laity has been of late brought somewhat prominently into view by the press. In the existing and impending deluge of vague ecclesiastical talk, which, disdaining and bursting its modest channel of the Sunday suburban midday dinner-table, now threatens to flood Parliament and society for an undefined period, the division is no doubt convenient as a form of speech, and is likely to pass current as representing a form of thought. The terms are already used as absolute, and the division treated as exhaustive. That the surface of the globe, as we learnt at school, is divided into land and water; that the human race, as we were taught in our freshman's year, is made up exclusively of "men" and "cads," are not propositions more entirely expressing facts in the order of nature, it would seem, than the clerical and lay distinction.

It is not therefore in any spirit of cavilling or presumption, but simply with a desire for accuracy of thought and clearness of expression, that we venture to suggest the inquiry, What is a layman? Into the higher and more abstruse aspects of this question we are not now prepared to enter. That there is an ideal or type of the order known as "the average layman" is so commonly taken for granted that he must be presumed to exist; and it is further presumable that the gentlemen who speak and write so fluently about him know what or who he is. An average, it is commonly believed, requires in the first instance a sufficiently wide induction, and in the next a careful and scientific comparison. The "average layman" must thus be discovered by means of a classification of the individuals comprised under the term, followed up by the separation, weighing, and measurement of that special quality, element, nerve-force, or whatever it be in each which is essentially and exclusively lay. Thus, as Dr. Lynn tells his audience, "You see how it is done." But, apart from this anthropological mystery, a preliminary doubt may be raised, and deserves some attention, whether there really is any such organized existence as a layman absolute and *per se*. The notion of a layman *ad hoc*, or a relative layman, is perfectly intelligible and familiar. Such a doubt is clearly not to be solved or met by any mere etymological or archaic considerations. The term "laic" may have borne, and probably did bear, a distinct meaning in the fourth century A.D., just as the term "Liturgy" may have done at Athens in the fourth century B.C.; and the one may be as little to the purpose in any question of modern interpretation as the other. Without raising the point whether a Peer Spiritual could properly be described as a "lay lord," it is evident that the latter term does not mean the same thing as a Temporal Peer, and the opinion of a person in holy orders, episcopal or other, upon a point of law would correctly be described as a "lay" opinion. Independently, however, of such technical subtleties, and assuming any person outside the clerical order to be in theory a layman absolute, it may be also taken as admitted that no one in practice uses the term, any exhaustive division notwithstanding, without some very large limitations. Mr. Bright's residuum, although they be Mr. Gladstone's flesh and blood, may be taken at once as excluded. Peers, squires, churchwardens, and vestrymen are equally of course within the defining line. But then there is such a great intermediate class. Is a verger, or a railway guard, or the prophet of a sporting newspaper, a layman in the sense known to the *Times*, or not? Because, when we come to discussing the introduction of "the lay element" into Convocation, it is really desirable that we should know to some extent what we are talking about.

No such difficulty of definition attaches to the correlative term, or second branch of the exhaustive division, whichever we choose to call it. By the clergy, for all current purposes of ecclesiastical conference, disputation, or talk in general, is meant one distinct and separate body of men in England. And it is commonly

assumed by a good many of our public instructors in the press, and believed accordingly in a hazy kind of way by a considerable portion of their audience, that between this body and that other sound-hearted, intelligent, powerful, if slightly vague and indeterminate, whole known as the laity, there exists a pronounced divergence, not to say a direct opposition, of aims, motives, interests, and all the rest of it. Polished editorial periods in London, and the downright hammer-and-tongs articles which issue from Leamington for the moulding of the agricultural mind, come upon this head to very much the same thing in the end. Suppose for a moment that all this declamation were based on sound statistical evidence, and that the issue were about really to be fought out, after the modern English fashion, in a general campaign of public meetings, with each side turning out all its available forces on the stump. In a fair trial of free speech, for perception of points at issue, for calmness in argument, for reasoning force and debating power, a comparison of the respective qualifications of the so-called lay and clerical minds would probably produce results both instructive and interesting. But society is likely to have some time to wait before any such results are published. The antagonism between the lay mind and the clerical mind cannot easily be marked and measured under the existing conditions of applied mental science, because, among other reasons, the method of comparison between things non-existent is a problem which has not yet been solved. The "lay mind," like the "average layman," is supposed popularly to exist in some sort of reference to the clerical mind and the average clergyman; and consequently, in the language of mathematics, if  $x=0$ ,  $y$  is impossible. If the "clerical mind" is an expression which conveys no sort of intelligible meaning, there can be no need to take much trouble in ascertaining what the "lay mind" may chance to be. That there may be in the higher ranks of the clergy a particular type of character and habit of thought is very possible. The episcopal type of mind is an expression which may be easily understood, and which may, for all we know, have a reality corresponding to the idea, existing possibly in less perfect development under decanal or capitular forms. But so, and in exactly the same way, there may exist a judicial type of mind; and perhaps a type representing the mind of permanent heads of Government offices. Any small and select body of men holding positions and exercising functions of exactly the same nature, and officially raised above the ordinary level of society, may very naturally fall into a sort of mental groove of similarity. Whether the possession of the office predisposes to the habit of mind, or the mental constitution has prepared and indicated the individual for the office, is a question which may be left to the philosophers. The existence of an episcopal type, if there be such, proves at any rate nothing about the existence of a clerical one.

There is, indeed, a type of mind which may be described generally as the ecclesiastical, and which admits of a good many varieties. It is very probably the confusion of the two distinct terms, ecclesiastical and clerical, joined to the familiar experience of divergence in the ecclesiastical varieties, which has prepared the way for most of the nonsense which we hear and read about the present and increasing antagonism between clergy and laity. Every one who is capable of thinking, and who has taken the trouble to think at all about the religious phenomena of this century, knows well that there is no variety of the ecclesiastical type of thought which has not exhibited its most pronounced, not to say exaggerated, forms in men not in holy orders at all. The half-pay officer who holds a Revival meeting in a watering-place occupies as a rule a far more advanced position in the "emotional" ranks than the Low-Church preacher of his choice; while in the opposite direction of the English Church Union it is well known that non-clerical partisan zeal often distances all clerical efforts to keep it within bounds. If anything further were wanting to exhibit the absurdity of confusing the ecclesiastical idea with the clerical, it would be shown by the fact that much of what is thus popularly described as clericalism is most conspicuously developed in the sex which is "not suffered to teach in the Church."

It is no doubt true that a good many clergymen both feel and manifest much intolerance of the presence of Nonconformists within their official radius; and as the squire, the doctor, and the colonel, to say nothing of the farmer or the retail tradesman, suffer no corresponding disturbance of mental equilibrium from this cause, such intolerance is constantly taken to be a "note" of the so-called clerical mind. It has obviously nothing to do with it. The squire has precisely the same kind of objection to a poacher, or, in a modified form, to the manufacturing parvenu who has made a sufficient fortune to float him into the commission of the Peace; and if he and his brother the rector had chanced to change places in the order of their birth, each would have naturally adopted the antipathy which a similar habit of mind has directed to the object lying for each in his own special path of life. The colonel objects to civilian interference in military matters. The doctor has not much love for the unlicensed practitioner; and the retail tradesman has "no connexion with the establishment over the way." It would be easy to multiply illustrations to show, point by point, that what is so commonly described as the "clerical mind" has no sort of existence in fact, but that it is very often only a phantom constructed out of a confused generalization from misunderstood instances. More frequently indeed the process of reasoning, or what passes muster for reasoning, is of a very much simpler kind. An individual clergyman says or does something, or is reported in a newspaper to have said or done something, which somebody else, being concerned in the matter, or more probably having nothing

whatever to do with it, is pleased at the moment not to approve. The clergyman may be in the right or in the wrong as it happens; but the chance conflict of opinion between the two individuals, clerical and non-clerical, is quite enough to establish a case for the existence of the "clerical type" of mind, and to form the basis for some very large generalization about an essential antagonism between the clergy and the laity. Talk of this kind is not the less mischievous because it is nonsense, seeing that nonsense clothed in sounding verbiage goes a long way in the world. The only sort of real, existing, *bona fide* antagonism between the two classes of which any evidence that we are aware of has been produced in recent periodical literature is found—and thus much we must in honesty admit—under the heading "Clergy v. Laity," in the current number of the *Haileyburian*, where we read that "The laity kicked off, and proved much too strong for their opponents, driving them back in every scrummage"; but ultimately "the clergy had the military added to their side, and" from that time "had slightly the best of it." That is about the measure of class antagonism which exists between the "scrummagers" fathers at present, or which is likely, when the boys have taken their fathers' places, to exist between themselves.

#### EPHING FOREST.

THE Master of the Rolls, in giving his decision on the question of the common lands of Epping Forest, expressed himself very plainly as to the conduct of the defendants. "What some of the defendants," he said, "had done was to take away other people's property without their consent, and to appropriate it to themselves." We are sufficiently familiar with this method of transferring property—"convey, the wise it call"—in the case of such things as purses and watches, but it is happily not every day that an attempt is made to appropriate three thousand acres of land in this simple and summary fashion. It is true that the defendants acted under the guidance of their legal advisers, and it may be assumed that they had persuaded themselves that they had somehow a right to what they seized upon. Delusions of this kind in regard to smaller and more portable articles are apt to lead to unpleasant personal consequences; but in this instance the persons who have been helping themselves to other people's property will suffer no further inconvenience than that of having to give up a part at least of their plunder. Twenty years being the limit within which restitution is demanded, appropriations made before 1851 will remain in the hands of those who hold them. The Master of the Rolls also made some strong remarks on the manner in which the defendants had conducted their case. The issue, he said, was a very simple one, and all the materials required by the Court for deciding it might have been furnished at a comparatively small cost. The defendants, however, had endeavoured to support their title "by a large mass of evidence which must be wholly discredited," and had added enormously to the expenses of the suit. It is satisfactory that the defendants are now to be compelled to surrender what they had illegally appropriated, but it is important to observe that they seem to have had every prospect of being left in peaceable possession of their plunder, and that it is only by a series of accidents that the Forest has been saved.

Mr. Lefevre's letter to the *Times* gives an interesting and instructive history of the progress of litigation in this case. For a long period there had been nibblings at the Forest, but it was not till about 1865 that the Lords of the Manors began their wholesale appropriations. A Committee of the House of Commons had just then been inquiring into the general question of the best means of preserving for the public use the forests and commons near London, and had come to the conclusion that the rights of commoners were amply sufficient to keep commons open and unenclosed. This rather alarmed the Lords of the Manors, and many of them took the opportunity of putting themselves in the advantageous position which is acquired by the actual possession of contested property. They had previously regarded the common lands as property which they might some day or other enclose when it suited their convenience; but they now thought to make themselves sure of it by enclosing it at once. Sir Thomas Wilson began his operations upon Hampstead Heath; the late Lord Brownlow added five hundred acres of Berkhamstead Common to his private park. Queen's College, Oxford, similarly, under the advice of its solicitors, seized upon two important commons and a smaller one in the South of London. Epping Forest was also pounced upon, and large parts of it enclosed. It was fortunate for the public that the Lords of the Manors did not show greater moderation and forbearance. If they had been content to go on gradually, taking in a little bit here and a little bit there, now insidiously advancing a fence in one quarter, or building a house in another, their depredations would perhaps have attracted little attention, except in the immediate neighbourhood of the places where they were committed; and from mere local opposition they had little to fear. When, however, it was seen that they were swooping down on open spaces in all directions, and that very soon, unless they were checked, London would be almost stripped of the noble belt of heaths and commons which had so long been her pride, and which in a sanitary point of view had now become a necessity to her inhabitants, a strong feeling of indignation was excited, and a number of persons had sufficient public spirit to come forward in defence of public rights. One night Mr. Augustus Smith

sent down a couple of hundred labourers from London in a special train to remove the strong iron fences with which Lord Brownlow had cut off part of Berkhamstead Common, and before morning the hurdles were all laid decently in a heap. In the suit which followed, the appropriations were declared to be illegal. After this Queen's College and other Lords of Manors deemed it prudent either to surrender claims which they could not enforce at law or to come to terms either with the residents adjoining the open spaces or with some public authority which would undertake the charge of them. In this way the commons at Plumstead, Bostall, Dartford, Tooting, Wandsworth, Wimbledon, and elsewhere have been preserved for the use of the public. Hampstead Heath was obtained only by a costly compromise, into which the inhabitants were driven by the prospect of protracted litigation.

In all these cases there was an important body of influential residents on the side of the public, and this naturally facilitated a settlement. At Epping, however, a large proportion of the resident landowners were in favour of enclosure. They had no relish for the wanderers from the East of London who came to spend their holidays in the Forest, and who did not always make themselves too agreeable during their stay; and, on the other hand, there was the temptation of getting a slice of the property, if it were divided. Accordingly, there seems to have been a general rush at the Forest pretty much in the spirit of the old saying, "Every man for himself, and the Devil take the hindmost." The Devil has indeed turned up in the form of the Court of Chancery, and those who were last in the race of spoliation will now have to disgorge; while those who were lucky enough to secure their share of the plunder before 1851 will be left to the enjoyment of it. It appears that in the course of the last twenty years 559 illegal enclosures have been made, and some of them have already been cut up for building ground, and are covered with houses. What it is important to observe is that all this property and more would have passed permanently into the possession of persons who had no legal right to it whatever, if it had not been for the accident that the Corporation of London happened to hold some ground within the limits of the Forest for the purpose of a cemetery. This gave the Corporation power to interfere on the ground that the enclosures were a violation of its rights of commonage; and the Corporation, being a rich and powerful body, has been able to make head against the Lords. At one time, it seems, before the intervention of the City, an old labouring man at Loughton was left alone to struggle against the Lord of the Manor. He had been in the habit of exercising an ancient customary privilege of lopping trees for firewood during the winter months, and when this was forbidden he refused to submit. He persisted in cutting wood, and urged his neighbours to do the same. Two of his sons and a nephew, who were found lopping, were summoned before the magistrates, one of whom had received a large share of the Forest, and were sent to prison for a week with hard labour. The old man obtained assistance to try the question at law, and, in spite of attempts made, now to buy him off, now to drive him out of the parish, so as to deprive him of his *locus standi*, the suit was kept going till it was interrupted by his death. Here the question would probably have ended if the Corporation had not been induced to take it up, and it was only through its being the owner of a cemetery in the Forest that it obtained a right to interpose. It is well that the Forest has been saved, but it is not comfortable to reflect that the chances were all the other way.

The whole subject of enclosures is one of great importance, and it is to be hoped that the Amending Bill of the Government, which is understood to be in preparation, will treat it in a thorough and comprehensive manner. The same sort of questions which have been raised during the last few years in the neighbourhood of London are also springing up in other parts of the country, and it is desirable that some distinct principle should be laid down by which the rights of proprietors on the one hand and of the public on the other may be equitably maintained. The difficulty of the matter is of course mainly due to the fact that the idea of a general public with any interest in the commons is entirely a modern invention. Formerly a common was an object of interest only to the people about it, who sent their cows, geese, and donkeys to graze there; and in recent years the exercise of this privilege has been gradually falling into disuse, simply because there is scarcely any one who cares to take advantage of it. On the other hand, the Lord of the Manor did not trouble his head about land which he did not see his way to turn to account, and was quite content to leave the commons open to anybody who chose to go upon them. The rapid growth of population, however, and especially the introduction of railways, have given a sudden value to these tracts of ground in the neighbourhood of large towns. The Lords of Manors are tempted by the high prices which are offered for "eligible building sites," and as the commoners are no longer represented by cattle, it is perhaps rather hastily assumed that they have ceased to exist. Another set of people now start up under the name of the public, but the Lords refuse to recognize their claim to have anything to do with the commons. It must be admitted that the rights of the public, as a public, have never assumed a legal form. It may be very necessary that all large towns should have open spaces close to them for the recreation of the inhabitants, but it is obvious that they cannot be allowed to take possession of any bits of ground that suit their purpose without reference to proprietary rights. On the other hand, it may be asked, whether the public ought not, under certain circum-



stances, to be recognized as having succeeded to the rights which the commoners have practically abandoned. Hardly anybody wants to turn out a sheep or a cow on the commons, but a great many people want to walk on them and enjoy them as open spaces; and whether the common is used by cattle or by people walking about cannot make any difference to the Lord of the Manor, as long as he is bound to keep it open. Mr. Lefevre proposes that all enclosures not authorized by Parliament should be *prima facie* illegal, and that any public body or public-spirited person should be allowed to represent the right of the commoners and to put the Lord to a strict proof of his claims. There may probably be some difficulty in regard to the latter part of this suggestion, but it is at least clear that some check ought to be put on such proceedings as the appropriations at Epping. It is monstrous that persons who have no sort of legal right to a particular property should be able to take possession of it offhand, and to maintain the misappropriation by the aid of a long purse and sharp lawyers. A Lord who wishes to enclose can hardly complain if he is required to give due notice of his intention to do so, and to justify his alleged right before he takes advantage of it.

#### PARTIES AND PARTY NAMES IN THE UNITED STATES.

THE extraordinary success which has just been gained by the Democrats in every part of the American Union, rendering it probable that at the next Presidential election they will be able to wrest from the Republicans the power now wielded by the latter for fourteen consecutive years, makes it of interest to inquire, What are the distinguishing principles of the two parties? The Democrats have been so hopelessly weak since the close of the Civil War that they have had no opportunity of showing what they would be likely to do, supposing them once more called to the administration of the country; and the "platforms" adopted by them in different States at the recent elections are so discordant that we get little information from a study of those documents. Thus in New York the principles of the Democrats have been summed up by their leading organ as "hard money, Free-trade, and Home Rule." In direct contradiction to this, the Democratic programme in Ohio and Indiana was inflation of the paper currency and payment of the National Debt in greenbacks; while in the South universally the demand was for non-intervention of the Federal authorities and a white man's government. If we turn from the platforms which have just carried everything before them to the names of the parties themselves, we obtain just as little enlightenment. It is true indeed that there is a very well-marked distinction between the terms Democratic and Republican. A man may be a thoroughpaced Democrat, and yet be a Monarchist, as we see in France at this very moment, where an audacious party is advocating the restoration of a "Democratic Empire." On the other hand, a man may be a Republican without being a Democrat, as again we see in France in the persons of many of the Conservative Republicans, or as was still better exemplified in Venice, in the Seven United Provinces, and in Switzerland. But these are not the distinctions that prevail between the Democratic and Republican parties in the United States. To understand the principles underlying their antagonism, it will be necessary to travel back to the years immediately following the Declaration of Independence.

When the War of Independence first broke out, the colonists, as is well known, did not contemplate separation from the mother country. They were Englishmen, settled in America, it is true, but not the less therefore entitled to all the rights and privileges of Englishmen, amongst them to the right of exemption from taxation when not accompanied by representation. Accordingly, the opponents of Lord North's measures called themselves Whigs, to indicate that they were members of the great party which had dethroned the House of Stuart and established English liberty. In like manner, the Loyalists, as supporters of the royal prerogative and the paramount authority of Parliament, were styled Tories. The term Tory continued to be employed to the end, but as the original object of the war was lost sight of, and the minds of the Americans came to be fixed upon independence, the name of Whig grew gradually out of use. But it is a curious instance of the force of old associations and of the influence which the habits of thought of colonial days continued to exercise, that, as we shall presently see, the name was revived more than half a century later. In the meantime the progress of the war made it quite plain that, if the league of the thirteen colonies, now become States, was to be perpetuated, a closer union was indispensable. By the Articles of Confederation, which formed the first Constitution of the United States, all effective sovereignty resided in the several States. Congress was simply an Assembly of delegates, competent to raise an army and navy and to negotiate with foreign nations, but with no real power to enforce its resolutions. It could not even levy taxes, except through the States, which practically contributed only as much as they chose. The several departments of the Government, until near the very close of the war, were presided over by Committees of Congress, not by Ministers, and there was no President. The Whig party, which had formed one body to resist England, became divided into two on the question whether the Articles of Confederation should be annulled or not. The Federalists advocated a closer union; the anti-Federalists were for maintaining things as they were. It has often been pointed out that these names ought to have been reversed. The Federalists, or at

least their most distinguished leaders, wished to form a Unitarian Republic; the anti-Federalists were struggling to preserve the Federation and the full rights of the several States. However, the Federalists succeeded in imposing these names on the two sections, and after a struggle of some years they proved successful also in their political agitation. A new Constitution was adopted, which divided the powers of government between a President elected for only four years, but clothed during his term of office with virtually regal powers, a Congress of two Chambers with greatly extended legislative competency, and a judiciary invested with extraordinary authority, and ramifying even through the States. The anti-Federalist party was broken up, and during the two administrations of Washington the Federalists governed the country. But, when once the object of drawing closer the union between the States had been attained, there was no real cohesion in the party. The experience of the war had convinced all thoughtful men of the necessity of an amendment of the Articles of Confederation. Hence Mr. Madison was as active as General Hamilton in advocating such amendment, and even Mr. Jefferson gave his approval. But Jefferson and Madison wished to invest the Federal Government only with such powers as were essential for the due protection of the Union against foreign aggression and for the perpetuation of the league between the States. They desired to limit both President and Congress to the authority delegated to them by the Constitution in express words, and to forbid absolutely all constructive powers. Mr. Hamilton, on the contrary, and the elder Adams, would have the Federal Government regarded as a real national Government, competent to employ the power of the whole Union for the development of its material resources. Mr. Jefferson retired from Washington's Cabinet, and under his leadership there grew up a new party, which was composed not only of the old anti-Federalists, but also of such of the Federalists as wished to confine within the narrowest limits the activity of the Federal Government. This party styled itself Republican, implying thereby that the Federalists were aristocrats at heart. Herein was another point of difference between the parties. Jefferson and his party heartily embraced the principles of the French Revolution, and proceeded to reduce to practice with as little delay as might be the doctrines of "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity." Hamilton, on the other hand, was an ardent admirer of the English Constitution. An anecdote recorded by Jefferson will convey to the reader a better idea of the political opinions of the Federalist leader than any description. While Jefferson, Hamilton, and the elder Adams were members of Washington's Cabinet, they met at Jefferson's house to consult on an important matter of foreign policy. After the business had been transacted, and in the course of a general conversation, Adams remarked that, if its corruptions were removed, the British Constitution would be perfect. "Remove its corruptions," replied Hamilton, "and it would be impracticable. With all its supposed defects, it is the most perfect Constitution the world has ever seen." Thus it will be seen that Hamilton was a disciple of Burke, and desired to give the United States a strong central government, and freedom tempered by authority, after the English pattern. Jefferson, on the other hand, held the views, while reprobating the atrocities, of the extreme French revolutionists, and he considered the maintenance of States' Rights and the restriction of Federal authority essential to the preservation of American liberty.

Mr. Jefferson became third President of the United States, and his party, with but three breaks of no great length, governed the country for the following sixty years. The Federalist party lost ground year after year, and became finally discredited when it fell under the suspicion of sympathy with Great Britain in the war of 1812. It struggled on for some time longer, but ultimately broke up about 1820, only to reappear, however, under the name of National Republican—a name skillfully chosen to express disavowal of sympathy with aristocracy in any form, and at the same time to proclaim that it regarded the Union as "a nation," not a mere congeries of States. But the National Republicans suffered the same fate as the Federalists, falling into utter disorganization in the course of a few years. They formed themselves again in 1832, however, to oppose the second election of General Jackson to the Presidency, adopting the old historic name of Whig. The Whigs twice elected Presidents—General Harrison in 1840, and General Taylor in 1848—but they also broke up in 1852, when the old Federalist party in its various modifications may be said to have finally died out. In the meantime the Jeffersonian party had introduced manhood suffrage, had extended citizenship to foreigners on the easiest terms, and had made nearly all offices, even the State judgeships, elective. Partly on this account, and partly to distinguish itself from the National Republican party, its members dropped the name Republican, by which it was known in Jefferson's time, and adopted that of Democratic, just as among ourselves the Whig party has been merged in the Liberals. But while the Democrats were thus actively carrying into practice their ideas of popular sovereignty, they were becoming more and more committed to the maintenance of slavery. For reasons which it would take us too long to enter into here, the main strength of the Democratic party had always been in the South, whereas New England was the principal support of Federalists and Whigs. Even in this matter, it will be seen, the antagonism between North and South thus early showed itself. But this circumstance made it almost impossible for the Democrats as a party to declare against slavery. Further, the existence of slavery gave the slave-owners more leisure for

study and attention to politics, and consequently the leaders of the Democratic party have been almost always Southerners. Lastly, the cardinal Democratic doctrine—the doctrine of States' Rights—bound the party to uphold the right of the separate States to exclusive jurisdiction over the question of slavery, and consequently to resist as an encroachment and an impertinence all attempts on the part of the inhabitants of other States to intervene in a matter of strictly internal policy. In this way the party which was most deeply pledged to respect “the inalienable right of all men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,” became irrevocably committed to the refusal of every human right to millions of men, women, and children. Had the South been contented with the maintenance of slavery, it would unquestionably have succeeded, as nobody but a mere handful of uninfluential and unpopular Abolitionists denied the exclusive jurisdiction of the States over the question. But the South was not so satisfied. It endeavoured to extend slavery by conquests in Mexico and the West Indies, and by carrying it into the Territories. The Territories, it is hardly necessary to explain, are those portions of the public domain of the United States which have been formed by Act of Congress into distinct legal communities, with Governors, Legislatures, and courts of law. But, unlike the States, they are not sovereign commonwealths. Their legal and administrative officers are appointed by the President, and their Legislature may be overridden at any moment by Congress. Now, the Southerners contended, and, except by appeal to Mr. Seward's “higher law,” it is impossible to rebut the contention, that they had a right to settle in any part of the public domain they chose, and to take their property with them. In other words, they maintained that it was the duty of Congress to recognize slavery in the Territories by protecting the property of such slave-owners as should settle in them in the slaves they carried with them. To oppose the claim thus put forward the Republican party came into existence just twenty years ago. It was formed in the first place of the remnant of the Whigs, to which body belonged the late Mr. Greeley, President Lincoln, and Secretary Seward; and of Free-Soil Democrats, men who had acted with the Democrats, but revolted against the extension of slavery. In the course of the two following years the new party was joined by the majority of the “American,” or Know-Nothing, party—a party whose bond of union was hostility to foreigners and Roman Catholics. The Abolitionists were for a long time allies rather than members of the Republican party, though they also ultimately joined it. And, lastly, when secession took place, the party was largely reinforced by “War Democrats,” men who would have suffered the extension of slavery to the Territories, but would not allow the break-up of the Union. Thus it will be seen that the Republican party was rather a coalition of fractions of parties opposed to certain specific Democratic measures than a party in the strict sense of the word, with definite political principles of its own. At the same time, however, it had one principle—opposition to the extension of slavery—for which was afterwards substituted the resolve to maintain the Union, and it inherited from the Whigs the desire to stretch the Constitution so as to increase the authority of the Federal Government, and to develop the resources of the country by means of Protection and internal improvements. It was not, however, Abolitionist until the ill success of the military operations undertaken against the South prompted the Proclamation of Emancipation as a war measure.

#### CEMETERIES AT HOME AND ABROAD.

**C**HURCHYARDS and funerals are gloomy things at best, and they generally wear their most offensive aspects for those who live in the crowded centres of civilization. Deaths are frequent and land is scarce; and when the bulk of the population is poor, and the obligation of providing mortuary accommodation falls upon the rates, the feelings of the living must often be sacrificed to their interests. There have just been some unpleasant revelations with regard to the suburban graveyards of Battersea and Tooting, and those who are implicated have admitted themselves to blame, pleading their straitened means in extenuation. We have no intention of dwelling on disagreeable details. The long and the short of it is that houses have been springing up and population increasing around the fixed areas of these suburban cemeteries. The soil is drained to an average depth of eight feet, but the graves have generally been sunk to a much greater depth. Notwithstanding, space has often been economized by laying coffin upon coffin without interposing the foot of hard-rammed soil enjoined by the statute. Below the drains there is frequently a bed of holding clay. The consequence is that the rain stagnates instead of sinking away; noxious gases are disengaged without being deodorized; the mourners suffer with the officiating clergymen at the frequent funerals, while inhabitants in the immediate neighbourhood must be constantly inhaling vitiated air. Of course it is always rash to jump to general conclusions from particular instances, yet we may be sure we are pretty safe in assuming that Tooting and Battersea are not very exceptional cases. Both neighbourhoods are tolerably well-to-do, and by no means especially crowded. And it must be owned that cases of this kind furnish plausible arguments to those who advocate cremation for old and overcrowded communities. For ourselves, we do not care to pronounce an opinion in the matter; but it is certainly undesirable that preventable abuses should strengthen the hands of those who advocate a questionable innovation.

In interments, as in everything else which is a question of money, the rich must always have the best of it. They can afford to pay for the luxuries of sentiment, as they can command the leisure for indulging their grief. Of late our English *pompes funèbres* have offered them great advantages. Formerly wealthy families had their private vaults, either in the church in which they worshipped or in the yard that surrounded it. Visiting the tombs of the dead they had buried out of their sight, they could enjoy little of that peaceful seclusion which the bereaved mourner covets above everything. Sanitary considerations apart, nothing could have been more trying than having to ask the beadle for the keys of a church every time they came to pay a visit, or having to make their way to the grave in the populous churchyard, with crowds staring in through the railings from the thoroughfares. Now that great country cemeteries have been brought into fashion, natural feeling would have triumphed over family pride even without the interposition of the Legislature. The Cemetery Companies assured themselves the best chance of a financial success by offering mourners unrestrained liberty of indulging their sorrow. Londoners have been particularly fortunate in this respect. As it happens, the home counties are singularly rich in the possession of invaluable barren ground which will never repay reclaiming. On heaths like Woking, beyond the ordinary range of residence of business men, picturesque sites are to be had for a comparative trifle. Lying high and bare of timber, the fresh breezes circulate freely, giving an invigorating sense of health and life by way of antidote to dismal associations. The soil is a clean gravel, and very much drains itself. Yet there is peat in the neighbourhood to be had for the fetching, so that rhododendrons, azaleas, and flowering shrubs flourish amazingly. Shooting up to town from South-ampton, through somewhat bleak scenery, that blooming oasis in the wastes has a singular attraction for those who would cherish the poetry of death. It enjoys as much sun and light as we ever have in England; there never need be crowding, and for all practical purposes there is always solitude enough. It is true that the family burying-ground may be far from the family residence. But railways nowadays annihilate space and time, and for those who make a religion of the memory of the departed, the very necessity which requires a kind of pilgrimage gives a certain impressive solemnity to periodical excursions to the tomb. In laying out these country cemeteries every town of any importance has followed the example of London, and in nothing perhaps has joint-stock enterprise done more for us. Had parishes and districts continued in all cases to provide graves for their rate-payers, they might possibly have paid some attention to sanitary considerations; but certainly they would have subordinated everything to economy. The most convenient piece of eligible land that the building speculators had neglected would have answered their purposes. As it is, the first idea of the promoters of a Cemetery Company is to invoke the aid of nature to advertise them. They lay themselves out to secure the most picturesque sites, and call the most eminent landscape gardeners into consultation. We say nothing of the ornaments in the way of statuary and sculpture, for these must necessarily be left to individual fancy, although even there we think we have improved upon the weeping angels bending over urns draped in palls. But now we can show provincial cemeteries that scarcely yield to any others in the world. Some of our readers may remember the romantic beauty of the necropolis at prosaic Greenock, with its broken hills embosomed in trees and blooming shrubs, commanding magnificent views of the Western Highlands beyond the widening expanse of the Frith of Clyde.

Foreigners had long anticipated us in this matter, although now we think we may flatter ourselves that we have passed them. Thanks very much to the tenets and practices of their religions, they have always had a regard for the poetry of the tomb. Roman Catholics keep the annual festival of All Souls in the cemeteries. Believing that the spirits of the departed are still within the reach of their prayers, they naturally seek to aid their devotions by kneeling over the graves. They pay their regular tributes to the memories they cherish with flowers and wreaths of *immortelles*, and these practices have their uses as well as their beauties. They secure the graves against neglect, and give them a general aspect of melancholy coquetry. At best, however, the coquetry is very much on the surface, and the disagreeables of the charnel-house will show through the garish coating of thin whitewash. Take Paris. Every visitor to it is familiar with Père la Chaise, and many people must have admired the cypress-covered slopes of Montmartre. But you cannot have visited them of an afternoon, and especially on a Sunday, without remarking how unceasingly the funerals pour into them. Spacious as they are, Paris has been extending itself out of all proportion to them. Let families increase and multiply and die as fast as they will, there is no room to strike out additions to those cramped little Grecian temples, the receptacles of their mortal remains. Those “concessions à perpétuité” engraved on their façades mean a great deal. For on the spaces devoted to the poor on the north and the east, the ground is perpetually being disturbed, and the dust shaken up in quicklime is always being stirred. It is not without reason that the question of rural burial-fields is exciting great attention among our neighbours, and we have only to read the articles in the Paris journals on the subject to be assured that the scenes which may be daily witnessed in early morning in those beautifully kept pleasure-grounds are utterly shocking to our sense of decency.

The “God's acres” in Germany are regarded with all the reverence which the name implies, yet for the most part they are quite as



much encumbered as burial-grounds elsewhere; and you may see the signs of it if you get a glimpse into the little dead-house in some obscure corner. Even where latterly they have extended their limits, as the cities to which they belong have burst out of the old fortifications, there too the sharp line is drawn between the rich and the poor, or even the moderately well-to-do. For example, there is the famous burying-ground at Nuremberg, devoted to its purpose, we fancy, by that famous Free City of the Empire, almost from time immemorial. At one end you see flowers and trees and broad walks in front of the chapels where the dead are laid out until the seal of death shall have become unmistakable. At the other is German organization carried out to the utmost; tombstones marshalled by line and rule in serried files, and regularly numbered up to thousands. In Switzerland, as might be expected, you come upon some of the most picturesque sites in the world for churches and burial-places. One remembers particularly the square churchyard at Thun, rich with creepers and flowers, and commanding from the seats under the stone summer-houses at its angles the most magnificently panoramic views over the blue lake and the snowy mountains. Yet at Thun, beautiful as it is, there is less lying-room than in most other places. The ground sinks precipitously all around, and wherever there is not an almost perpendicular precipice, the graves come clambering up to the enclosures. In some Southern countries, where the lifeless clay is surrounded with ceremonies before interment, the people are often singularly heedless of what becomes of it when committed to the soil. There are tolerably thriving old cathedral towns where children and young girls are always being theatrically exhibited in *chapelles ardentes*, or paraded in procession along the streets in wreaths and gloves and ghastly draperies. You see funeral after funeral go by, when after a time it strikes you of a sudden that somehow you have never stumbled on the burial-ground. If you go in search of it, you find it in some remote nook, and are puzzled to conceive how it can possibly suffice for the population. The mystery may in a measure be solved if you have chanced to attend the afternoon interments at the old Campo Santo at Naples. There you will find three hundred and sixty-five pits; a pit is opened on each day of the year; the priest on duty performs the rites *en masse* over all the deceased of the day before; the contents of the surrounding biers are shot out down the orifice; there is a sprinkling of holy water and a shower of quicklime; the circular slab is replaced, and all is over. The Mussulman cemeteries in the East are as gloomy as may be. Every one must remember those great forests of cypress, casting their black shadows on the rough-hewn stones below, with the sculptured turbans and other emblems of the faithful; but with these cemeteries the infidels who may die in these parts have no concern. Not that the Christians, at least at Constantinople, need regret it, for their own resting-places are the most beautiful in the world. There is Scutari, on the crest of the heights, the pure white marble of its graceful monuments rising out of an Eastern garden against the cloudless blue of an Eastern sky. Even more attractive are some of those wild outlying enclosures, dating from the war-time, on which you light in the neighbourhood of Buyukdere or Therapia. Often, indeed, they are almost lost to sight in the rank undergrowth of tangled vegetation, till you can scarcely force your way to an examination of the epitaphs; but then they are sacred from intrusion or desecration. Yet, lovely as they are, the relatives of their tenants might think the romance of those half-forgotten resting-places but an indifferent compensation for their hopeless remoteness, and, remembering that England is the country of the rich, we may on the whole congratulate ourselves on surpassing the world in what may be called cemetery-gardening.

#### THE "RENTERS" OF DRURY LANE THEATRE.

THE history of Drury Lane Theatre has been told this week in the Court of Common Pleas. That history has been often told before both in prose and verse. Many poets compared the theatre when it was rebuilt, after burning, to a phoenix; and one of them supposed that this phoenix had been shot for the "pot" by Arabs, who resolved first to roast and then boil it:—

So Drury, first in roasting flames consumed,  
Then by old renters to hot water doom'd,

rose out of conflagration and litigation,

By Wyatt's trowel patted, plump and sleek.

An Act of Parliament of 1810 recites that the existence of well-regulated theatres, substantially built, and capable of affording the best accommodation, has always been considered to be a matter worthy both of royal attention and legislative protection. The Act further recites that the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane had been rebuilt in 1794, and that "great sums" had been expended on it, and heavy claims incurred. "And whereas in the course of a successful progress towards the liquidation of the said claims the said Theatre Royal, with all its scenery, wardrobes, furniture, and other articles was wholly destroyed by the calamity of fire in the year 1809," the Act proceeded to incorporate a Company of Proprietors for rebuilding the same. The Company thus formed was managed by a Committee who understood business better than literature. When the theatre was finished, they incurred general ridicule by advertising for an opening address to be sealed and delivered like a tender for a con-

tract. We have all heard of tradesmen who kept a poet, and there is a story of a British tourist who introduced himself to Canova, saying that he understood that like himself he was in the stone and marble line. These stories go some way to justify the reproach that we are a nation of shopkeepers, and certainly this step of the Committee of Drury Lane Theatre was a thoroughly huckstering proceeding. The addresses sent in answer to their advertisement were so execrable that the critics of the day wondered that the Committee did not choose one of them. The debates in the Committee-room were compared to the confusion of tongues at the Tower of Babel, and when they determined to reject all the tenders and apply to Lord Byron to write an address, they were likened to a firm which should advertise a lottery, and, after selling all the tickets, announce that there would be no drawing, as they intended to transfer the 20,000*l.* prize to a friend of their own.

But although this Committee deserved all the hard things that were said of them, they earned the gratitude of posterity by giving occasion for the composition of *Rejected Addresses*, which will be read as long as the poets whom it parodies. Scott did no more than justice to the description of the death of Higginbottom the fireman, when he said that he certainly must have written it himself, although he forgot on what occasion. Almost better than the "Addresses" themselves was the criticism upon them of a Leicestershire clergyman who did not see why they should have been rejected, as he thought some of them very good. The "Address" which introduced that "feathered incombustible," the phoenix, is still quoted for its happy ridicule of the extravagant anti-Bonapartism of the period. Wellington at Salamanca

Breaks through his lines, and leaves his boasted Marmont  
Expiring on the plain without his arm on.

For twenty years after the *Rejected Addresses* appeared everybody knew them and understood allusions to them. Thus Mr. Greville in his Memoirs records a joke of Luttrell. Somebody quoted the first line of the parody of Coleridge, and Luttrell said the public was pensive and the King (George IV.) expensive. The lines will bear quoting now when they are less generally known:—

My pensive Public, wherefore look you sad?  
I had a grandmother, she kept a donkey.

His face was sad, and you are sad, my Public.

But the public has cause for joy. The author had wept over the ruins of the theatre, and feared it would not be rebuilt, until one joyful Monday eve, walking along Charles Street, he heard a trowel tick against a brick, and saw that the work of reconstruction had begun. From that hour he watched the builders, and listened to the talk of others who also watched:—

While some believed it never would be finish'd,  
Some, on the contrary, believed it would.

This is a grotesque poem, but not perhaps much of a parody of Coleridge. The genus of the collection are the imitations of Scott and Crabbe; an extract from the latter might have been read to the Court of Common Pleas by way of "inducement," as lawyers say, to the plaintiff's declaration for assault and battery:—

Now the full benches to late-comers doom  
No room for standing, miscall'd "standing room."  
Hark! the check-taker moody silence breaks,  
And bawling "Pit full!" gives the check he takes;  
Yet onward still the gathering numbers cram,  
Contenting crowders shout the frequent damn,  
And all is bustle, squeeze, row, jabbering, and jam.

The parody of Southey is scarcely intelligible without notes. But perhaps we might have guessed that Veeshnoo was Mr. Whitbread, who had all the talents of a manager, and also that common weakness of fancying he could write himself. One of the "Addresses" actually rejected by the Committee of which Mr. Whitbread was a member is said to have been written by him. Sheridan declared that he had introduced a phoenix into his poem, and described it like a poulticer. He was one more instance of the desire of men to be that for which nature has not fitted them. But he also was the energetic man of business:—

He treats with men of all conditions,  
Poets and players, tradesmen and musicians;  
Nay, even ventures  
To attack the renters,  
Old and new;

just like a manager of the present time. We believe that both history and poetry agree in ascribing to Mr. Whitbread, or Veeshnoo, the merit of bringing about the compromise of the renters' rights on which the plaintiff's claim in the recent action was founded:—

Veeshnoo, now thy work proceeds;  
The solicitor reads,  
And, merit of merit!  
Red wax and green ferret  
Are fixed at the foot of the deeds.

It is not surprising that the popularity of these *Rejected Addresses* rather threw into the shade the Address which was actually delivered. Yet Byron's vigorous lines are still, after more than sixty years, only too applicable to the management of this theatre:—

If e'er frivolity has led to fame,  
And made us blush that you forbear to blame;  
Nay, lower still, the Drama yet deplors  
That late she deigned to crawl upon all-fours.  
When Richard roars in Bosworth for a horse,  
If you command, the steed must come in course;  
If you decree, the stage must condescend  
To soothe the sickly taste we dare not mend.

The Committee, under the guidance of Mr. Whitbread, cut out some of these lines, much to the disgust of Byron, who implored "one lash at those accursed quadrupeds." A manager who has produced *Formosa* and got up a tournament in *Richard Cœur de Lion* may console himself under the censure of these bitter lines by observing that they applied almost equally to his predecessors, the contemporaries of Garrick and the Kembles. There was, however, this difference, that sixty years ago the "accursed quadrupeds" did not keep possession of the stage for many successive months. Indeed the "renter" who has lately come before the Court is a creature of a bygone age. When he stipulated for a free admission every night, he contemplated the acquisition of a valuable privilege. But any man who could willingly see *Richard Cœur de Lion* half a dozen times must have come out of a lunatic asylum or be on his way to one. When the "renters" acquired their rights the bill was changed every night, and many of these renters went as frequently to the theatre as subscribers now go to the opera. But we have changed all that, and the change is distinctly for the worse.

The question before the Court of Common Pleas was tolerably simple, and probably only a lawyer could have invented the defence which was set up to the plaintiff's claim. Under the arrangement made in 1810 each "new renter" is entitled to 1s. 3d. for each night of performance, and to free admission to the usual audience part of the house. When the theatre was opened in 1812 it contained fourteen private boxes, and all the rest of the house was confessedly accessible to the "new renters." The pit in those days extended to the orchestra, and it was not till thirty years afterwards that pit-stalls were introduced. The present manager claimed in substance to exclude the "new renters" from the pit-stalls, except on payment of the difference between the price of a dress-circle ticket, which is 5s., and that of a stall ticket, which is 7s. His notion was that a "new renter's" right was represented by 5s., but this seems to be a merely arbitrary assumption. Mr. Daune, the plaintiff in the case, claimed and received a ticket for the dress-circle, and, not finding a convenient place there, he then claimed to pass into the stalls. He received a ticket marked "dress-circle cross," and on presenting this at the entrance to the stalls two shillings was demanded of him, which he refused to pay. Being refused admittance, he proceeded to assert his right, and was then expelled by the defendant's servant, who, in the language of pleading, *moliter manus imposit* for that purpose. There does not appear to have been more violence used on either side than was necessary to raise the question of right; and, looking to the character of the defence set up, we feel bound to say that the plaintiff deserves the thanks of his fellow "renters" for asserting his right by costly litigation. Very few of the class would be likely to show the courage and pertinacity to resist what appears to be a usurpation, and thus by lapse of time the large right which the Acts of Parliament professed to confer would become limited. The defendant contended that the plaintiff had exhausted his "renter's" right for the night by entering the dress-circle, and could only pass to the stalls like one of the public by paying the difference in price. But this is a mere unauthorized gloss on the statute, which enacts that the "new renters" shall be entitled to the "free liberty and privilege of admission into the usual audience part of the theatre before the curtain," except the private boxes. This right, however, must be exercised reasonably, and is subject to regulations properly made by the proprietors. It is conceded that the "new renter" cannot book his place beforehand except by payment, and the manager seems to be at liberty to turn the whole of the dress circle into private boxes, as is in fact done during the opera season. In this season also the whole of the pit is converted into stalls, and all these stalls might, we believe, be let beforehand. The manager has however hitherto set apart a certain number of stalls for the "new renters," and they have also access to the upper circle of boxes, which is called during the theatrical season the "first" circle. It can easily be conceived that these "new renters" are regarded by the managerial mind as a troublesome relic of antiquity. But the attempt to improve them out of the theatre by force of law does not seem hopeful. The defendant has, however, stated his intention to appeal against the adverse judgment.

## REVIEWS.

### SPEEDING'S BACON.—VOL. VII.\*

IT is not easy to choose appropriate terms in which to congratulate Mr. Spedding on the completion of his labours. Of the length and variety of those labours few will need to be reminded: the publication of the *Life and Letters and Occasional Works* alone has now extended over thirteen years, and seventeen years have passed since Mr. Spedding and his associates put forth the first of the long series of volumes to which this standard edition and biography now extend. Yet Bacon's biographer and joint editor, if an author of many pages, is a man of few words. In this concluding volume itself, where the temptation to expand in the direction of comment might have proved irresistible even to many writers habituated to self-restraint, it would be difficult to point to

a paragraph which is, strictly speaking, superfluous, and it would certainly be impossible to find a sentence which is irrelevant. Mr. Spedding, with grave politeness, leaves to "the debating societies" the settlement of the question whether "the character of Bacon was deserving of the approbation of posterity." For himself, he is contented to achieve his endeavour of enabling posterity "to form a true conception of the kind of man Bacon was," and of effecting this by following him step by step through the "unusually full record of a more than unusually full life." The result is a biographical monument to which it would not be easy to find a parallel in English literature, least of all in that of our own generation. The works of Bacon, together with the Commentary, may now at last be deposited, as he wished his *De Augmentis* to be, in the great College by honouring whose most illustrious member three of her sons have likewise honoured her and themselves; and there, and wherever wisdom and patriotism are cherished, this endeavour to preserve the memory of their great exemplar may be left to produce its fruit—"tanquam in solo nativo."

On the present occasion our remarks must be confined to a few of the topics suggested by the volume before us. It begins with the close of the year 1618 (O.S.), so that it includes the last seven years of Bacon's life. In other words, we have here a view of two of the most active and important years of Bacon's official career, of its sharp and sudden termination, and of something less than five years of bitter adversity, tempered by little besides sustained intellectual effort and such hope as a self-consciousness rising above outward circumstances can give. We accompany Bacon from the days when the Favourite was importuning him with letters on behalf of his friends, and when the King was sending him, on the occasion of their simultaneous sickness, "great pledges and certainties of his love and favour," to those other days when, shut out from London, the fallen statesman was exclaiming in a rare moment of bitter irony that he was "no Jesuit nor no leper," and when, thinking his hour was near, he bequeathed his name and memory "to men's charitable speeches, and to foreign nations, and the next ages." Between these times lies the catastrophe itself. With reference to this, the chief value of Mr. Spedding's narrative is to be found in the fact that it fairly forces the reader to dismiss from his mind all hypotheses which have an imaginary Bacon for their basis. Even so, and notwithstanding the biographer's scrupulous care in distinguishing probable conjectures from established facts, and ethical theories from principles of law, it is not easy to guard against mistaking their relative weight in determining a final conclusion. Thus, in arguing (we think, very justly) that, astonishing as the supposition may seem, the charge against Bacon came upon him as a surprise, Mr. Spedding is most careful to explain the nature of the data on which he has arrived at this result; but the reader, though he may have no excuse for misapprehension, will not find himself relieved from the necessity of extreme caution. To the offer made by the Lord Chancellor as late as February 17th (Awbrey's petition was presented on March 14th) to the Committee for Courts of Justice, "that any man might speak freely anything concerning his Court," we should indeed hardly be inclined to attribute so much significance as Mr. Spedding seems to see in it. The letter to Matthew, which Mr. Spedding assigns with extreme probability to about the middle of March, may of course have been written at some earlier time; for "the Lord" mentioned in it can only conjecturally be identified with Digby; nor is there, we presume, any actual proof that Matthew was then at Brussels. But this letter and the other likewise (it cannot be doubted) addressed to Matthew, taken in conjunction with the offer made in February, and with the tone of the well-known letter to Buckingham ("Your Lordship spake of purgatory")—a tone of indignation rather than real despondency—will leave no reasonable doubt as to the correctness of Mr. Spedding's view, unless the reader has set out with the assurance that Bacon had been a conscious offender in his judicial administration. Now of course there is nothing easier than to assume this, if one wishes here as elsewhere to apply Macaulay's development of a paradoxical antithesis, or, like Kuno Fischer, to suit Bacon's conduct to a particular view of the man previously constructed out of a particular view of his works. But of evidence that Bacon had at any previous time been conscious of misconduct in his office, or that, up to almost the very last, he had anticipated any charge in this direction, there is no trace. Indeed the very statement that, in the beginning of March, Bacon had been warned of Awbrey's intention, and, though at first denying the imputation, had been so far disturbed as to take measures to cause Awbrey to retract or forbear it, appears to rest on a mere rumour, as will be manifest on referring to the authority quoted by Mr. Spedding. And the same is the case with reference to the similar story of Bacon's reception of the first tidings of the Egerton charge, a story to which we think Mr. Spedding does not refer. But, however this may be, the spirit of Mr. Spedding's view remains uncontradicted by what Bacon said or attempted to do so late as this, while there is abundant evidence to show what opinion Bacon consistently held as to the general course of his judicial administration. Even when he had come to regard his sentence as "just," and, again, as "the justest censure in Parliament that was these two hundred years," he continued to look back with conscious pride on his administration of his Chanceryship; described himself, when writing from the Tower to Buckingham, as "the justest Chancellor that hath been in the five changes since Sir Nicholas Bacon's time"; and, in a private assurance confidentially imparted to his secretary, and

\* *Letters and Life of Francis Bacon.* By James Spedding. Vol. VII. London: Longmans & Co. 1874.



neither intended for publication nor indeed published by Rawley again spoke of himself as "the justest judge that was in England these fifty years." It would be a perverse view which should see in this a "St. Helena" confidence.

Into the merits of the whole case we cannot now enter. Mr. Spedding's discussion of the subject, however, makes it more manifest than ever that the real difficulty is not to be sought in the conduct of Bacon during the progress of the inquiry. This conduct was so far consistent that he never throughout the entire proceedings was false to the promise which he gave at their commencement to the Lords, that he would not "trick up an innocency with cavillations." On examining his case and preparing for an interview with the King, Bacon recognized that he had erred; but it was not till the eleventh hour that he recognized, or indeed could have recognized, to what extent he had erred. It was when the number and range of the charges first became known to him that he abandoned his position; and, instead of adhering to the hope of being able to reduce the offences of which he stood accused to cases of negligence, sought in a general submission and confession the best remaining prospect of lenient treatment. This change of attitude, so far from pointing to a consciousness of corruption, seems to us rather to support the view that negligence—culpable negligence—had been the wrong committed by Bacon, but that it was not till the charges became known to him that he recognized their overwhelming number. "The articles were," as Mr. Spedding says, "too many," though we should hesitate in subscribing to the words he adds—"and the mind of the House too manifestly made up." On the other hand, there can be no doubt that the method of verdict adopted by the House of Lords—namely, that of convicting the accused *super totam materiam*, instead of pronouncing his guilt or innocence on each of the twenty-eight charges *seriatim*—practically leaves the particular charges to be tried over again by posterity. But posterity is only very imperfectly able to do so, and must content itself with arriving at certain general conclusions which seem to amount to the establishment of much culpable negligence, yet not of that corruption which Bacon (in the note prepared by him for an interview with the King) defines as "bargain or contract for reward to pervert justice, *pendente lite*," and of which he (in the same note) declares his belief that he is "as innocent as any born upon St. Innocent's day." And here comes in the fact, urged with much force by Mr. Spedding in his summary at the end of this volume, that there are no traces to be found of an actual reversal of any of Bacon's decrees in Chancery.

We cannot follow Mr. Spedding into his argument on the question whether the taking of gifts (without corrupt intention) in itself constituted a legal offence in a Chancellor as it did in a Common Law Judge; and the evidence as to the practice of previous Chancellors confessedly reduces itself to a matter of conjecture. We should in any case be slow to agree with those who demand from a great man, even in those fields of action with which his greatness is associated, an immediate self-emancipation from evil practices or principles in vogue before him. We can believe in the elevation of Bacon's motives as a judge, though he took gifts, as we can believe in the progressive spirit of More, though he was a persecutor. But there was some force in a remark made in the course of the debate which arose in the Lords on the Chancellor's submission, that it was not becoming that he should throw the blame of his faults on the age rather than on himself. Only a moral pedant will fail to make allowance for the anguish of mind in which Bacon had written the confession at the close of which he asks their lordships not to "forget that there are *vitia temporis* as well as *vitia hominis*." But we may regret that he did not follow to the last the higher impulse which had prompted him, in the note already cited, to set down how "all this while, I do not fly to that, as to say" what he could not refrain from urging upon his judges. Such a plea ill consorts with a spirit born to advance his age, and befits a Bacon as little as that still lower plea befits common men which Cicero ironically advances when pretending by way of contrast to excuse some of the doings of Verres—"Forsitan aliquis aliquando ejusmodi quippiam fecerit." Yet what seems a poor apology in Bacon's mouth cannot be overlooked as an element in the consideration of his case by the dispassionate judgment of another age.

Though Mr. Spedding adheres to a rigid personal method which would prove an intolerable restriction to the "Life and Times" class of biographers, there is nothing of greater interest in this volume than the light thrown upon Bacon's aims and wishes in relation to the foreign policy of his country. In matters of home government not specially connected with his own office, there was more than one occasion during the last two years of his Chancellorship on which he manifested a striking political foresight. His advice to the King recommending the distribution of particular branches of Government business among standing commissions was followed in spirit, if not in detail, by later ages, and has in part survived into times to whose requirements it is not invariably so well adapted as to the conditions of Tudor and early Stuart constitutional life. His arguments, on the other hand, in favour of restoring the responsibility of the Treasury to a single officer have a wider and more enduring significance. His proposal of rules for the Star Chamber (though their spirit can be only indirectly gathered), made at a time when there was, so far as we know, no public feeling against the court, might, if realized, have remedied, as Mr. Spedding sagaciously suggests, the very defect which ultimately brought

the court to its fall. But of the general system of domestic government pursued in these years Bacon was after all a supple and intelligent agent and no more—willing to accommodate himself to courses over which he had no control, and upon which he never exercised a more than secondary influence. In proposing the commissions aforesaid, he begs the King not to be deterred by the fear that some will conceive such a step to be merely a preparation for a Parliament. Yet he only ventures to hint that such an impression would do no harm; he does not indicate any opinion on the subject of the summoning of a Parliament itself. When in 1620 this step had been determined upon, he dutifully set to work to expedite the preparations for it; but his draft of a Proclamation was treated by the superior powers after a very unceremonious fashion, and the Chancellor was swift to "approve his Majesty's judgment and foresight above his own." On the question (purely one of policy) as to the advisableness of revoking the most obnoxious patents before the assembling of Parliament, Bacon, who strongly urged this course of action, had to acquiesce in the contrary decision—a very unfortunate one, as it happened, for himself. In a word, the respect paid to his counsels fell far short both of their value and of his readiness in offering them, and his anxiety to advance the interests of the King, his Minister, and his subjects ("for I do not love the word People"), was much greater than his power to influence the policy of the Crown.

This was, of course, most emphatically the case in the domain of foreign affairs; but here, where Bacon's advice was least continuously able to exert any influence, his political views were perhaps most definite and most in accordance with the prevailing national sentiment. It does one's heart good to see how thoroughly, on the all-important topic of the relations between England and Spain, the wishes of so discreet and cautious a counsellor were in accordance with the healthiest current of public opinion (in which we do not for a moment deny that there was a great admixture of prejudice); and after following Mr. Spedding's record up to the very period preceding the declaration of war, one seems more fully to appreciate the feeling which moved Bacon, in the brief will drawn up by him at the most critical moment of his career, to express a particular wish for the publication of his eulogium *In felicem memoriam Regine Elizabethæ*. To James and his Government he might display the "morigeration" of a loyal servant, but his heart was with the old days. In the letters and tracts of this the greatest man of the age we meet with the same feeling—often of course guardedly expressed, but equally consistent and intense—as that which pervades the despised "popular" literature of the times. He firmly believed in the dangers to be apprehended from Spain; he longed for war with that Power; and the spirit in which he viewed the prospect of its immediate declaration may be gathered with sufficient clearness from the *Considerations* drawn up by him in 1624—one of the most patriotic and stirring papers in the whole range of our political literature.

Neither Bacon nor the "orators and pamphleteers" to whom Mr. Spedding refers in a superior way which he occasionally permits himself could of course penetrate the secrets of the Royal policy. Yet Bacon's instinct at least was often truer than the fulness of the King's knowledge. Early in 1619, to which period Mr. Spedding assigns the *Short View of Great Britain and Spain* attributed to Bacon, the author of this paper was already recommending war with Spain as both just and likely to prove successful. The King had, however, entered upon his attempts at mediation, begun by him as the dupe of Spain, which had already elsewhere expressed its readiness to support the House of Austria with money, and if necessary with men. Of the nature of Bacon's advice both immediately before and after the acceptance of the Bohemian Crown by the Elector Palatine, though we know it to have been sought at both times, it is peculiarly unfortunate that no evidence should remain. In the second stage of the history of the question, which may be dated from 1620, when it had become clear that the Palatinate was in danger, it is equally certain that James was once more the dupe of the Spaniards, and that Bacon was intent upon a vigorous course of action which the King was as yet unwilling to adopt. The Chancellor was most willing to promote the King's wish for the suppression of the "licentious course of talking and writing" among the public at large; but he advocated a clear exposition of the existing situation in the Proclamation to the Parliament now contemplated, including a declaration that "a concurrence of reasons and respects of religion, nature, honour, and estate," had determined the King to recover the Palatinate to "his son and his descendants." But this seemed to the King to be moving too fast. Two subscriptions were opened for the war in the Palatinate (Mr. Spedding's remarks on the latter of these seem to us open to criticism, especially as he has not, so far as we observe, mentioned the former, to which there was more reason to demur); but James was still indulging the hope of inducing Frederick to resign the Bohemian Crown, and thereby causing Spain to co-operate in the restoration of the Palatinate to its rightful owner. But there were those who, without the King's opportunities, saw more clearly into the policy of Spain than he; and if a paper (*For the freeing of the Palatinate, &c.*), probably belonging to the period, was, as seems very likely, written by Bacon, he perceived what had been the result of the King's trust in the upright intentions of the Spaniards. "The confidence," it is observed in this paper, "they (i.e. the Spaniards) had in his Majesty that he would not break with Spain, was the encouragement without which I think Spinola would never have set upon the Palatinate."

Of the proceedings in the Parliament of 1621 with regard to the Palatinate Mr. Spedding takes a view on which we should feel disposed to make some strictures were it not that Bacon no longer played any part in public life in connexion with these transactions. When Parliament separated with an enthusiastic general declaration of readiness to support the King in his determination to recover the Palatinate, Bacon was a fallen man, and could only signify in a brief letter to Buckingham his joy in this "day of very great honour to his Majesty." In his exile—for such it was to him—he continued to take a lively interest in the course of foreign policy, and to entertain the same views as to the direction which it should take. Oddly enough, he was the means (by information which he loyally forwarded to Buckingham) of stopping "a Papal aggression" in the shape of the appointment of one or more titular Catholic bishops in England; for Gondomar, who at that time was really in earnest about the Spanish match, and had some reason to believe that he really held the alliance of England in his hands, very speedily arrested the unseasonable project. When, on the return of Prince Charles and Buckingham from their famous visit to Madrid, the days of a decisive anti-Spanish policy seemed at last to have set in, Bacon, with unwonted eagerness, displayed his wish to be once more of active service. He offered most sagacious advice to Buckingham, to whom the public interest moved him to speak with remarkable frankness, and even volunteered to pay a visit to France, in order to help in the tying of a "strait league" with that country. He prepared notes for a speech concerning a war with Spain, to be delivered by a member of the House of Commons; and, finally, he composed a treatise addressed to the Prince, already referred to above. In once more directing the reader's attention to this masterly essay, we may point out that it contains, in addition to an historical summary of English struggles with Spain, which must still stir the heart of every Englishman, an argument on the justice and expediency of *preventive* wars specially worthy of the attention of some Englishmen of a later generation—"otherwise reverend men, yet fitter to guide penknives than swords." These *Considerations* are not the least noble of Bacon's legacies to his nation; and the spirit which they attest should not be forgotten among the causes which ought to make Englishmen at least careful of his fame.

#### THE VALLEYS OF TIROL.\*

WE must say a word or two upon the title of this book. The Tirolese themselves, as Miss Busk remarks, always spell the name of their country Tirol, and there seems to be no good reason for the ordinary English change into Tyrol. We agree with her again that there is as little reason for prefixing the definite article. We might just as well say "the France" as "the Tyrol." So far we find ourselves in perfect agreement with Miss Busk, nor have we any great fault to find with the substance of her book. Such criticism as we have to make may as well be got over at once. In her title-page Miss Busk professes to describe the traditions and customs of the Tirolese valleys, and to tell us how to visit them. We cannot say that a lady who is prevented from crossing a good carriage pass by the enormous quantity of luggage belonging to her party is quite competent as a guide to a mountain country. She is unable to penetrate into the more primitive parts, though she contrives to see some of the most characteristic districts. In another respect the book is a little too ambitious. Miss Busk's primary object appears to have been to collect the popular legends of the country, as a contribution to the study of what is called folk-lore. This very praiseworthy design is, however, complicated by the intrusion of a great deal of purely guide-book information. We can read in Murray or in Ball the list of the statues on the Maximilian monument at Innsbruck; and we do not particularly care to have them over again in a book which does not aim at being a comprehensive guide. And, finally, we may say that we object to the style in which some of the legends are narrated. Miss Busk very properly criticizes a German author who, in collecting some Italian stories, has deprived them of their local colouring by translating the names of the mythological beings into those of the analogous persons in German legend. Perhaps it may not be equally misleading, but it certainly produces a sense of discord when we find a story professedly taken down from popular speech arrayed in the conventional trappings of literary English. The error is not carried to an offensive excess; but here and there it rather annoys us.

We have said enough, however, upon these points. The book, where it is devoted to its legitimate purpose, may help other travellers to interest themselves in the characteristics of one of the most remarkable populations in Europe. Nowhere else, it is probable, can we find so perfect a specimen of the survival of an ancient type amongst the discordant elements of modern Europe. The people of the Zillertal, with their picturesque costumes, their national music, their passion for athletic exercises of all kinds, and their deep attachment to their old religion, are a race whom it is difficult to regard without some feeling of envy. If the democratic ploughshare could level the mountain-barriers which still keep the nineteenth century at a distance, it must be admitted that, whatever might be the material gain, there would be a heavy loss in the extinction of this characteristic type. It is natural to suppose that this conservative race, whose religious

ideas are still of the mediæval kind, must preserve popular legends with unusual fidelity. Miss Busk declares that one's whole surroundings are so religious in Tirol that the masses of frozen streams by the side of the railway "assumed in the half light such forms as Doré might give to prostrate spectres doing penance." An imagination full of crosses and chapels and votive offerings may easily turn any natural object into the resemblance of some religious symbol. A good many of the stories here collected belong to the general stock of Roman Catholic legend, and are marked at most by some superficial alteration to adapt them to local circumstances. Round every town there are shrines where some Saint was martyred or where some holy hermit lived in old days; and miracles of the usual kind assert the sanctity of the spot. They vary from stories of the most recent times to legends dating back to the early ages of Christianity; and, indeed, many of them are probably of earlier origin, and have merely received a Christian dress from their later narrators. The Virgin has appeared to lonely herdsmen or village maidens in the Eastern Alps as she has appeared to devout peasants in France. One of the most curious of the modern miracles happened in 1797. A girl was looking through the window of her father's cottage when she saw upon one of the panes an image of the Virgin. The neighbours were called in, and so much noise was made about the matter that a painter and two chemists were appointed as a committee of investigation. They said that the image had been originally painted on the glass and that the faded colours had been restored by the action of the atmosphere to which it was exposed. The people, however, stuck to the theory that it was of supernatural origin; and were confirmed in their belief by the disappearance of a pestilence and the retreat of the French army. Here we can trace a legend to its foundation. Elsewhere we have examples of a curious method in which an historical narrative becomes blended with older mythological elements. A legend tells how a peasant going home one night, after a convivial evening, found it convenient to sit down on a bank, and was surprised by the sight of the *Berchtl*, followed by a train of the souls of unbaptized children. One of these little ghosts was troubled by the length of its clothes, and the kindly peasant made a girdle for it out of one of his garters. The *Berchtl* promised him in return that his children should never come to want. Now this mysterious *Berchtl*, according to the Tirolese, is the wife of Pontius Pilate, who was pardoned for her intervention with her husband, but has to do penance till the last day by wandering over the earth. Sometimes, indeed, she is guilty of spiteful performances which are not in character with her supposed repentance. The comparative mythologists say that *Berchtl* is derived from a root meaning bright; and see in her the white goddess of winter. Now in 1651 a perfectly historical person, named Biener, who had held a high position in the government of the country, was executed owing to some very cruel treachery. His wife lost her senses in consequence, and escaping from her keepers wandered into the mountains. The people naturally say that she is wandering there still, proclaiming her husband's innocence; and as the *Berchtl* wanders about in the same kind of way, the two characters have become identified in the popular imagination. Elsewhere, a hermit of the seventeenth century has already got mixed up with a Saint of the fourth, who was in the habit of riding about on a bear. Miss Busk adds an appropriate anecdote of a little girl in a Sunday School, who, being asked the other day what David was before he became King, replied, he was Jack the Giant-Killer.

The religious legends, except in some modern touches, seem to show very little that is characteristic of Tirol more than of other Catholic countries. They are better preserved; but are not essentially different. The same is, of course, true of many of those popular stories which go the round of the world in slightly different shapes. Miss Busk gives us one story from the Italian Tirol, which is identical with that of the curious old ballad of Binnorie, where the harp made out of the bones of the murdered sister (it is a brother in the Tirolese version) tells the story of her death. Directly afterwards we are told as a legend the substance of the nursery-song about the four-and-twenty tailors who went to catch a snail. But not to dwell upon such familiar coincidences, it is perhaps rather disappointing to find that the wonders of Tirolese scenery have not made a more distinctive impression upon the character of the stories. There are of course some stories of the kind which give to various English places the name of Lover's Leap. The natural impression that a good leaper might jump a certain chasm has got itself translated in the popular mind into the conviction that somebody did jump it on a sufficient occasion. Then, of course, the mineral treasures of the mountains suggest a good many legends; but these are not peculiar to the mountains. If there is a "green-clad huntsman" near Innsbruck who guards a treasure buried in an old fortress, we naturally remember the green huntsman described in the introduction to one of the cantos of *Marmion*, who does just the same in the castle of Franchemont in Belgium. A small class of legends more distinctly belonging to the mountains are those which account for some curious rocky cleft. Wherever there is a hole in a cliff the natives appear to have been astonished, and in Switzerland they generally call on St. Martin, with his gigantic walking-stick for a perforating tool. In Tirol we find a more picturesque form of the legend, telling how a cleft was opened in a rocky wall to enable a Saint to escape from certain heathen persecutors. The legend, however, which seems to be most widely spread is one which is familiar to the Swiss traveller in the case of the Blümlis Alp. In that case it would be easy to rationalize. The impropriety of the name "flowering Alp," as

\* *The Valleys of Tirol*. By Miss R. H. Busk. London: Longmans & Co. 1874.



applied to a snow mountain, is obvious. In fact, it doubtless was originally applied to the pasturage at the foot, and the mountain is properly called the Blümlis Alp Horn. When, however, the name was extended to a snowclad peak, the explanation easily suggested itself that the mountain had once deserved its title, and had been cursed in punishment of some profanity of the herdsmen. We find, however, that the legend occurs in a great variety of places, and it may perhaps be interesting to students of glacier phenomena as pointing to the great changes which have taken place in the extent of the icefields within historical times. Miss Busk gives us several different versions. The best known case perhaps is that of the Dunerthal, a lofty and barren valley shut in by a mountain called the Gefrorene Wand. The legend here scarcely introduces any supernatural agency. It says that the people were punished for their extravagance by the gradual chilling of the country and freezing of the mountain wall; but the fact might very well have happened, though we may doubt the judicial purpose. Elsewhere, on the Hochsanger Alp, we have a more picturesque addition about a bright bird which warned the one virtuous man of the valley to escape before the rocks fell and crushed the offending race. But, not to go into further detail, we may perhaps say that the imagination of the people shows comparatively few traces of the striking phenomena of a mountain country; unless we prefer the hypothesis that Miss Busk failed to gather such stories because she kept too close to the beaten tracks. We suspect, however, that the other is the true state of the case, and that even the patriotic Tirolese are less impressed by the wonders of their dwelling-place than the traveller to whom those wonders have the additional charm of novelty.

#### GEORGE'S GENEALOGICAL TABLES.\*

**M**ONARCHY and aristocracy have their advantages, no doubt. Amongst the various merits of a monarchical form of government, it may be mentioned that the Kings' reigns serve as convenient, if not very scientific, divisions by which to date the laws and histories of the country. But, notwithstanding this and other claims to respect, there must have been moments in the life of every historical student when he felt that, however useful or ornamental kings and nobles may be, nothing could atone for the trouble which their genealogies give, and when he almost began to sigh for a Republican Utopia governed by gentlemen of the pavement who never knew who their ancestors were. It is not our intent here to preach a moral discourse on the evils of which genealogies have been the cause, or at least for which they have served as the pretext—to expatiate on the national misery brought about by the Hundred Years' War, the contention of the Houses of York and Lancaster, the French claim to the Duchy of Milan, the Spanish and Austrian Successions, and, latest case of all, the Franco-German War. Neither do we mean to take for a text "Is it my fault that I was Geoffrey's son?" and to dilate upon the private sufferings of those unhappy beings who in former days got beheaded, blinded, banished, consigned to life-long prison or perpetual surveillance, whose marriages were interfered with, and whose hearts were broken, because they had the misfortune to have some drops of Royal blood in their veins. We only speak now of the torment which genealogies cause to those who have to learn and to remember them. It is not every one who can run off a genealogical claim with the fluency of the captive Marquis of Lantenac, when he utters his fierce tirade against the Rights of Man:—"Qu'est-ce que vous nous chantez avec vos droits? Droits de l'homme! Droits du peuple! Cela est-il assez creux, assez stupide, assez imaginaire, assez vide de sens! Moi, quand je dis,—Havoise, seigneur de Conan II., apporta le comté de Bretagne à Hoël, comte de Nantes et de Cornouailles, qui laissa le trône à Alain Fergant, oncle de Berthe, qui épousa Alain le Noir, seigneur de la Roche-sur-Yon, et en eut Conan le Petit, aïeul de Guy ou Gauvain de Thouars, notre ancêtre, je dis une chose claire, et voilà un droit." We wonder how many people could say offhand why James I. objected to Arabella Stuart's marrying William Seymour, or why the De la Poles, Poles, and Courtenays were more dangerous than other English noblemen and gentlemen of their time. Indeed the English nobility, about whose real names, as distinct from their titles, people in general are very hazy, and whose titles passed from family to family with bewildering rapidity in the days when one of the privileges of nobility was to have its head chopped off on slight occasion, are particularly puzzling. Every Earl of Warwick is popularly taken to be the King-maker; unless an exception is made in favour of Guy, and even his name suggests rather the slayer of the Dun Cow than the genuine Guy who helped to cut off Piers Gaveston's head. Surrey the poet is not very distinguishable from Surrey the victor of Flodden, and "Achtophel" Shaftesbury passes for the author of the *Characteristics*. Then there is a large class—of whom Lionel Duke of Clarence, described with substantial accuracy by a child in one of Miss Yonge's stories as "the man that bothers one so about York and Lancaster," may be taken as a representative—whose sole or principal title to fame consists in their forming important links in a pedigree, and who are remembered chiefly as names with the dates of birth, marriage,

and death affixed. There are the complications and occasions for confusion brought about by second, third, and fourth marriages, which are enough to make one wish that the Vicar of Wakefield's great doctrine of monogamy had extended to and been accepted by the laity.

It is no doubt quite possible to exaggerate the importance of genealogies, to be in fact in the mental condition of the above-mentioned Legitimist Lantenac, and we suspect that children are often unnecessarily tormented with the pedigrees of kings and pretenders to kingship; but still genealogies are absolutely necessary to any one who studies at all minutely. Names, dates, and genealogies are "the dry bones of history"; but the author of the work before us gives another and less opprobrious turn to the well-known metaphor, taking it to imply "that they are the necessary framework without which history has no coherence, though they are to a great extent clothed with more attractive matter when history is treated as a whole." To the difficulty of retaining genealogies in the memory must be added in many cases the trouble of hunting them out through various books of reference. This labour at any rate Mr. George proposes to save to historical students by bringing together in one volume all the genealogies likely to be required in the study of modern history. "I have attempted," he says, "to include every reigning house the personal relations of which have been of any importance in European history, and every name of any historical note connected with those families." At the outset, nine tables are given to the History of England, including, besides the Royal Houses and their kith and kin, one of "the Nevills and Families connected with them." The King-maker and his house may well be thought almost as important as the Royal lines of York and Lancaster. In the table headed "The White Rose" we find "Henry, Lord Montague, beheaded 1538"; but we miss Montague's fellow-sufferer, Henry Courtenay, Marquis of Exeter. The descent of the Courtenays generally from Edward I. is indeed shown in an earlier table, but there is no notice of the marriage with a daughter of Edward IV. from which Exeter derived his York blood and in great measure his political importance. His son too, the Earl of Devon, merely by virtue of being an offshoot of the White Rose, came into sufficient notice in Mary's reign to entitle him to a place here. A little more help, too, might have been given towards the understanding of the Arabella Stuart complications. Arabella herself and her Stuart-Tudor descent are shown in one of the two tables which suffice for the modest needs of Scotland; but her husband, William Seymour, is not included by name among the descendants of the Duchess of Suffolk. Yet it was this descent from a daughter of Henry VII. which caused King James to look upon him as such a peculiarly dangerous match for Arabella. Except for these trifling omissions, the English tables are drawn up with judgment, and give a great deal of information, particularly with regard to the various noble families connected with the Royal Houses. We notice a few errors in dates, which are of course very liable to arise in a work of this class. Eustace, son of King Stephen, died, not in 1152, but in 1153; Geoffrey, son of Henry II., died neither in 1182 nor in 1196, both which dates are given, but in 1186; Henry Stafford, Duke of Buckingham, was beheaded, not in 1485, but in 1483; and Jane Grey met the same fate in 1554, and not in 1553. In cases where a man has married more than once, the wives' names are sometimes printed one below the other, a method which has the disadvantage of making all the children appear at the first glance to be the offspring of one wife. A closer inspection, however, will show that in almost all these instances figures are placed above the children's names to denote whether they were the issue of the first, second, or third marriage; and the omission of these in the table of the "Saxon Line" of Kings has the effect of making Kings Æthelbald, Æthelberht, Æthelred, and Ælfred all look like sons of Æthelwulf by his second wife Judith, whom he did not marry till seven years after the birth of his youngest son Ælfred. With respect to Æthelred the Second's first wife, who is here set down undoubtedly as "Ælfrida, daughter of Thored," we may observe that both her name and parentage are matters of great uncertainty.

From England we pass to Germany, to which are devoted twelve tables, many of them full and intricate enough to make the student shudder as he reads. In the table of "The Welfs and their Connexions" we note a rather serious blemish—a wrong maternal descent is assigned to the line of the Dukes of Modena and Ferrara. This House sprang from the marriage of the Marquess Azo of Este with Gersendis, daughter of Hugh Count of Maine, while from the same Azo's previous marriage with Cunegund, daughter of Welf, the House of Brunswick, as is here shown, derives its origin. But though Cunegund duly appears in the table, Gersendis is omitted; so that her son Fulk, ancestor of the Modena line, appears as a son of Cunegund, and therefore as a whole instead of a half-brother of Welf of Bavaria, Azo's son by the first marriage. Mr. George indeed warns us that he has occasionally omitted the names of "wives taken from obscure families." But he can hardly look upon Gersendis of Maine as of obscure family, or even as individually insignificant, considering the extent to which she was concerned in the revolt of Maine against William the Conqueror in 1073. The table, we admit, is constructed for the sake of the Welfs, and not of Maine or Modena; but though that would be a reason for omitting Marquis Fulk of Este altogether, it is no justification for giving him a wrong mother.

Next to Germany comes France, starting with Hugh the Great, for the Carolingians are very properly put down to Germany, so that no student of these tables will be in danger of taking Charles

\* Clarendon Press Series. *Genealogical Tables Illustrative of Modern History*. By Herford B. George, M.A., F.R.G.S. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1874.

the Great for a Frenchman. In French affairs one might fancy the guidance of a Legitimist spirit had been followed, for, though Mr. George traces the elder branch of the Royal House down to the Count of Chambord, the Orleans branch is cut short at Louis Philippe, with only a sign to intimate "that there were descendants of whom no account is here given." This slight to the Count of Paris is the more marked because there is a blank space below Louis Philippe's name, which, as far as symmetry is concerned, would have looked better filled up. Considering the damage done by the Fusion to the prospects of the Orleans Prince, he might be granted the small favour of appearing side by side with Henry V. The Bonapartes, too, as a family which has played, and may play again, an important part in the history of France and of Europe, should have had a place accorded them. It is true that the great Napoleon and his son are allowed to appear, but only in the humiliating position of connexions of the House of Hapsburg. Though Mr. George thinks it necessary to trace a descent for Harold, son of Godwine, from Harold Bluetooth, the relationship between the First and the Third Napoleon is apparently of no consequence in his eyes. Yet Harold was certainly not made King of the English on account of any connexion with Danish Royalty; while Louis Napoleon did owe his Empire in great measure to the fact that he was his uncle's nephew. If the line of Bonaparte is ignoble, so was that of Sforza, which, however, duly appears among the ruling Houses of Milan. After France come five tables of the ruling Houses of the "Border Countries"—Counts and Dukes of Burgundy, Princes of Orange-Nassau, Dukes of Lorraine, Dukes of Brabant, Counts of Flanders, Namur, Hainault, Luxemburg, and such districts, whose very names suggest disputed successions, wars, treaties, and the Balance of Power. Last in this division comes the House of Savoy, after which Italy naturally follows. Under this head come the House of Anjou in Naples and Provence and the rulers of Milan and Florence—Visconti, Sforza, and Medici. Under the title of the Spanish Peninsula are included, beside the rulers of Spain, Portugal, and Navarre, the Aragonese princes in Sicily and Provence, and the Bourbon princes of Naples and Parma. It is a lesson in political history to see how the Italian princes have to be hunted out among Frenchmen, Spaniards, and Savoyards, amid the intricate and conflicting claims of rival dynasties. For the sake of those who have laughed over the rise and fall of Rabagas, and have traced the fortunes of Florestan, we rather desire a genealogy of the Princes of Monaco; but we own that it would not be of much practical use, and that we should probably be pained by not finding in it any information about that model of princely bearing and sentiments who was so sorely exercised by the *Crapaud Volant*. With the kingdoms of Central and Northern Europe—a large division, taking in Hungary, Poland, Bohemia, Scandinavia, and Russia—and the Christian dynasties in the East the genealogical tables end; but lists are added of the Popes, the Turkish Sultans, and the Caliphs, Mogul Emperors, and Shahs of Persia.

From this summary of the contents it will be seen that, with the exceptions we have commented upon, Mr. George has well redeemed his promise of including every reigning House in Europe whose relations are of importance to the student of history. The manner in which the tables are drawn up makes them generally clear and easy to follow, and their usefulness is much augmented by the addition of brief historical notes. The compiling of a work of this nature is a laborious and somewhat ungrateful task. Genealogies are hard to make out and to draw up, the liability to error is great, and the compiler gets much blame if he is wrong, and comparatively little credit when he is right. Supposing perfect accuracy to have been obtained, still success depends in great measure upon mechanical considerations, such as the clearness of the printing, and the convenience generally of the book for reference. In these points Mr. George has been well served. The paper is good, the print black and distinct, and the book opens readily. Those who have ever been irritated by a book of reference which stubbornly refuses to stay open at the place required know that, though this last merit is not of a very high order, it is nevertheless a great one as far as practical usefulness is concerned.

#### SLAVONIC LITERARY HISTORY.\*

THE book now before us forms the first volume of a projected history of the literatures of the various Slavonic peoples. Its author may be supposed, judging from the form of his name, to be himself a Slav, and he fills the post of Professor of Slavonic Philology and Literature in the University of Gratz, in Styria. He possesses, therefore, qualifications for the task he has undertaken not often met with in a scholar who chooses to write in German; and as he has combined with his mastery over Slavonic material a thoroughly German method of working—patient, painstaking, and conscientious—he has produced a work about the value of which there can be no doubt. It remains to be seen whether he will be able to complete in a satisfactory manner the onerous task to which he has applied himself, but the present volume may be considered a decided success. Were it only for its ample lists of authorities on the various subjects with which it deals, it would be invaluable to all who occupy themselves with the antiquities of the different Slavonic peoples, and who are desirous of knowing

what has been written upon them of late years. But it can boast also of other and higher merits, offering to its readers not merely a pile of references or a crude mass of extracts, but a well-arranged series of results which testify to patient industry and critical acumen.

After a few remarks on the various schemes which have been propounded with regard to the classification of the Aryan languages, Dr. Krek turns his attention from the other linguistic families to the North-European branch which divided into the Teutonic and the Slavo-Lettic. After dwelling briefly upon the characteristics of those two sections, he then, discarding the former of them, follows the latter till its split into the Lettic and the Slavonic subdivisions. With p. 33 he begins to deal with the Slavs as an individual people. After a glance at the various opinions held by the learned on the vexed question of Scythian nationality, and some reference to the uncertain light thrown upon the early history of Slavonic settlements by the researches made of late years among tombs and other receptacles of antiquities, Dr. Krek proceeds to construct a picture of early Slavonic life deduced from the direct evidence of historic witnesses and the indirect testimony offered by language. Without committing himself to any decision as to the exact date of the earliest Slavonic settlements in Europe, he represents the Slavs as dwelling for a long period of obscurity in forests and other places which they found almost destitute of inhabitants, before they became to any extent familiar to the occupants of the neighbouring countries. The number of words for cattle and for corn common to the Slavonic peoples points to an early acquaintance on the part of the Slavs with a pastoral and agricultural life; the collective name for grain, for instance, being *jito*, a word radically connected with the Slavonic equivalents for "life" and "to live" (in modern Russian *ex. gr. jizn* and *jit*, &c.). As a good illustration of the statement that much light is often thrown on the history of an object by its name, he discusses the various designations given to a foreign kind of grain, our buck-wheat. Not having been known to the early inhabitants of Europe, there exists no general European name for it. That it passed into some countries from Greece is proved by the Russian *grecha* and the Polish *gryka*; that the Tartars had something to do with it is suggested by the Bohemian, Polish, and Little-Russian *tatarka*, the German *Taterkorn*; to the Turks and Saracens point the Slovenish *turčica*, the French *sarrasin*, the Italian *saraceno*; to the Heathens refer the Slovenish *hejda*, the Serbian *hejda*, the Wendish *hejda*, the German *Heidenkorn*, and to Pagans the Bohemian *pohanka* and the Polish *paganka*. The Hungarians appear to have copied the Slavs, for the Magyar forms of the name are *hejdina*, *pohanka*, and *tatarka*.

Among the old Slavonians the ties of relationship were of great force, and in each household the head of the family ruled supreme, a patriarch whose dominion there was none to dispute. But of the despotic power of an individual over a tribe or race or nation there is for a long time no trace, and slavery, except in the case of prisoners of war, appears to have been unknown. So widely spread seems to have been the communal system that no words existed in early times to express individual property or inheritance; at least no such terms are now possessed in common by the Slavonic languages. Of the religion of the ancient Slavs little that is precise is known beyond the fact that it was a *Naturcultus*, a worship of the personified forces of nature, combined with a reverence paid to the spirits of the dead which appears to have amounted to a kind of worship of ancestors. That they believed in good and evil supernatural influences is evident, and the words by which they designated the two classes are used but with slight alteration by their modern representatives, as the names of God and the Devil—in Russian, for instance, *Bog* and *Bés*; but Dr. Krek discards the idea that the Slavs recognized anything like a Zoroastrian dualism, a contest between a White and a Black God, a *Bélbog* and a *Chernobog*. Their mythology, like that of other kindred nations, was familiar with a conflict between the darkness and the light, the night and the day, as well as between winter and summer, the sleeping and waking or the death and revival of the earth. But he is of opinion that a special White God, in antagonism to a Black God, never existed, except in the minds of writers who looked back on the heathenism of their ancestors with Christian eyes. Of undoubted, unsuspected Slavonic gods, unfortunately, not much is known. The name of the supreme deity, Svarog, Dr. Krek thinks ought not to be connected with either the Indian Varuna or the Greek Ouranos, inasmuch as it is derived from a root *sur*, to shine (and is perhaps akin to *Surya*, the sun), but Varuna from *var* (*uri*), to cover, &c. Yet he admits that, so far as mythological meaning is concerned, Varuna and Svarog may safely be considered as near relations. Perun, the Thunder-god, he is inclined to admit as an original Letto-Slavic divinity, perhaps identical with the Indian Parjanya, rather than to consider him as a West-Slavonic imitation or adaptation of the Teutonic Thor. The vexed name of Svyatovit is discussed by him in a long note. He rejects Dobrovsky's explanation of his name, as meaning the "Holy Conqueror," as well as that which sees in it the "Holy Light," and he does not even refer to the suggestion that Svyatovit and St. Vitus are one. The first part of the name, according to him, means "strong," and the second he deduces from a root *vi*, to blow, Svyatovit having been properly a god of the winds. About such suspicious deities as Rigl, Mokosch, &c., he is utterly sceptical.

Of the inferior supernatural beings known to the old Slavs Dr. Krek gives a very interesting and valuable account. He leaves in uncertainty the etymology of the word *Vila*, the

\* *Einleitung in die slavische Literaturgeschichte.* Von Gregor Krek. Graz: Leuschner & Lubensky. 1874.



name given by the Servians to the fair but cruel nymph who haunts the mountain and the stream. Her sisters, the Russian Rusalkas, he thinks, may possibly have borne the same name in olden days, for which their present designation may have been substituted in Christian times. The Vampire myth he considers an old Slavonic conception, rejecting Hanusch's idea that it could not have originated among the Slavs because they burnt their dead; and he agrees with most philologists in looking upon the words which signify in so many languages a werewolf or vampire—such as the Greek *βουρκάλας*, the Turkish *vurkolak*, the Albanian *vurvolak-u*—as being imitations of the Slavonic *vlkodlak*. We may take this opportunity of mentioning that, while he does not accept Fallmerayer's celebrated hypothesis that the modern Greeks are of Slavonic extraction, he looks upon them as a race in whose veins runs a by no means unmingled blood, a considerable Slavonic element having been absorbed and assimilated by the Hellenic inhabitants of a land which in many parts was at various times overrun by Slavs. The number of Modern Greek words which are of Slavonic origin is estimated by Miklosich at 129, and only seven of these are of universal prevalence. A much greater influence has been exercised on the language of the Hungarians by their Slavonic neighbours. About 846 Magyar words have been borrowed from Slavonic dialects, 32 among them relating to the Church, 37 to the State, 110 to the animal world, 150 to the vegetable, 40 to clothing, 48 to eating and drinking, and so forth. It is curious to see how far more accommodating in this respect Hungarian has proved than Greek.

While dealing with metamorphoses of words, Dr. Krek gives some interesting illustrations of *Volksetymologie*. The Slovenes, he says, declare that men were formed from the drops of sweat which fell from God's forehead upon earth. This idea was evidently suggested by the similarity between the word *chelo*, forehead, and *chelovek*, man. A Slovak legend tells how Christ and St. Peter were wandering afield one hot day, and the sweat of their brows fell in drops to the ground. St. Peter remarked that it would be a pity if they were wasted, whereupon Christ formed out of each drop a bee, and bees thus came into the world. The explanation of this legend is found in the close resemblance between *chelo*, the forehead, and a local word for a bee, *rchela*, or even *chela*. According to a similar kind of "folk-etymology" many names of places have been wrongly referred to alien sources. Thus Drenopolie offers a Slavonic aspect to observers who do not know that it is merely a corruption of Adrianopolis; and, on the other hand, Ellbogen and Dürrenmaul seem absolutely German until we learn that they were originally intelligible to Slavonic ears as Milbohov and Drmaly. Of Slavonic *Volksterminologie* also Dr. Krek gives some interesting examples. Thus a species of bi-coloured heartsease goes in Russia by the name of "Ivan and Maria," or the "Brother and Sister." The story connected with the plant is that a youth married a maiden whom he met in a foreign land. But, on questioning her about her lineage, he discovered that she was his sister; whereupon he and she became a flower, the brother blooming as its yellow petals, and the sister as its blue. In all Slavonic lands the wild thyme bears a name meaning the "Mother's Spirit." The Bohemian explanation is that a mother died and left behind her weeping orphans. And in her grave she mourned for her little ones, until at length her spirit came forth, and changed itself into a perfume-breathing floweret.

These legends lead us by a natural transition to the second part of Dr. Krek's volume, in which he deals with the folk-songs and folk-tales of the various Slavonic peoples. His familiarity with the numerous languages or dialects in which they are written enables him to deal with this subject in a most satisfactory manner, his notes teeming with valuable references. After giving a sketch of the various hypotheses relating to the origin of popular fictions, with especial reference to the well-known views of Benfey, Weber, &c., on the relations between the popular literatures of the East and West, as well as to the less familiar studies of Buslaef, Orest Miller, Stasof, Veselofsky, and many others on Russian songs and stories, he gives his own opinion on the subject of Slavonic popular tales and sagas. They appear to him, not foreigners acclimatized in Slavonic lands, but primitive heirlooms of the Slavonic people, "ein uralter Besitz des slavischen Volkes." Even where a foreign element seems to betray itself, he is inclined to trace it, not directly to an Indian source, but to a unity of idea in the mind of man itself. On this point we are not entirely of his opinion, deeming that the direct influence of the East on Slavonic popular fiction has been much greater than he is inclined to allow, but it is almost the only point on which we feel tempted to join issue with him. If he completes his book in the style in which it has been commenced, it cannot fail to prove of the highest value, a work well worthy of being set in a place of honour as a companion and supplement to Schafarik's *Slavonic Antiquities*.

#### PATRICIA KEMBALL.\*

THIS novel is distinguished by qualities which entitle it to a place apart from the ordinary fiction of the day. It is not a mere kaleidoscope medley of characters and incidents thrown together, as it were, by a turn of the hand, but an acute and serious

study of certain phases of English society which the writer regards as especially characteristic of the temper and tendencies of the present generation. In speaking of it as a serious study, however, we must not be supposed to imply that it is a dull or heavy work. On the contrary, it is written in a very clear, lively, and interesting style, with a pleasant effervescence of satire and epigram rising through it like the air-bells in champagne, and displays genuine humour as well as keen social observation. Whatever may be thought of the artistic merits of this romance, it is impossible not to enjoy the intellectual vivacity which pervades the whole of it, and gives it its distinctive flavour. Some of the figures may be rather shadowy, and the startling development of the plot towards the close is certainly open to criticism; but enough remains of graphic portraiture and witty observation to furnish materials for half-a-dozen novels of the everyday kind. It is, in short, a book full of matter. The reader has the satisfaction of feeling that he is in communication with a writer who, however little he may sometimes agree with her, has really something to say, and who knows how to say it with point and spirit. A novel with ideas in it is certainly something to be thankful for.

The story opens at Barsands, a little fishing village on the picturesque North Cornwall coast, surrounded by wide and rugged uplands and purple moors. The little community of fisher-folk represents society in its most primitive and unsophisticated form; and "everywhere there is movement, freshness, and the sense of life and freedom." Here Patricia Kemball, an orphan, has passed her early years under the care of her uncle, an old naval officer, who has taught her to be truthful, loyal, and unselfish, but otherwise has left her pretty much to herself and chance. She has had a little superficial schooling, but is sadly ignorant of elegant accomplishments and the niceties of decorum. She is passionately fond of boating, riding, and all kinds of outdoor exercises, and we get a glimpse of her scampering over the country with her flapping straw hat half-way down her back, and her long brown hair flying like a mane behind her. The old man dies suddenly, and Patricia is transported to Milltown. Instead of the wild open sea, she finds a land-locked, placid bay, shallow and uninteresting; every hedge and bank for miles round is trimmed and combed like a croquet lawn, and the whole face of the country has been smoothed down till not a vestige of natural beauty is left in it. The change in the external aspect of the scene is matched by a change in the conditions of social existence. From the breezy shore and the free and active life at Barsands, Patricia passes into a sphere of dull artificial compression and elaborate restraint. It is the rule of Abbey Holme, where she goes to live with her aunt, that there must be no bustle, no noise, no quick impulsiveness or disturbing enthusiasm. Mrs. Hamley is a rigid disciplinarian who is anxious to be kind to her niece, but has no conception of being kind to any one except in her own stiff and uncompromising way. She has found suitable material for her system of regulation in a cousin of her husband's, Dora Drummond, who lives with her as an adopted daughter, and who humours her caprices, conforming to all her ways, and answering her like an echo. Dora has discovered that the most effectual means of exercising influence over Mrs. Hamley is to make things pleasant by always agreeing with her and doing whatever she desires. She is content to drift with the tide, backwards or forwards as the case may be, without attempting the slightest resistance. Yet, as presently appears, she has projects and secrets of her own, and what she cannot get openly she schemes to obtain in another way. From the description which is given of this interesting young person we might almost suspect mischief from the first. We are introduced to a fair young woman "with a small head round which are coiled and twisted innumerable braids of golden hair as small and glossy as spun-glass, blue eyes with light lashes, eyes that do not look straight and steady, but have the most bewitching little trick of shy observation, fleeting, half ashamed to be caught observing." After this the reader will perhaps not be surprised to find that Dora has a key of an old garden-gate, which nobody knows is ever opened, and holds midnight interviews with a young gentleman of the neighbourhood, to whom indeed she even contrives to be privately married.

As the story goes on, the honest, outspoken simplicity of Patricia is contrasted with the unscrupulous deceit of her companion, who retains her place in Mrs. Hamley's good graces by her usual methods, while Patricia is constantly getting into trouble through her candid impulsiveness. Her frank vigour disturbs the tranquillity of this quiet, over-regulated household, and Mrs. Hamley sarcastically remarks that when Patricia goes out of the room she expects to see sticks and stones whirling behind her as in the track of a high wind. She is full of generous affection and anxious to win her aunt's goodwill, but her attentions operate like an irritant instead of a salve. She disturbs sacred cushions lying on sacred sofas, plunges about for footstools, denudes corners of their appointed ornaments, and generally makes a "commotion of kindness." Mrs. Hamley is undoubtedly one of the best-drawn characters in the book. She is not at all an unkind or intentionally malicious woman, nor is she stupid. It is only her intense self-sufficiency that leads her astray. Her central creed, we are told, is the plasticity of human nature when taken in time and firmly handled. "There was one settled and unalterable way of right, to her thinking," and of course that was her own way. We have a capital sketch of her waiting for her husband when he is late for lunch. She will neither order it to be put off, nor sit down to it herself, but sits immovable with crisped lips and noiseless forbearance, and her eyes fixed on the clock, till Mr. Hamley

\* *Patricia Kemball. A Novel.* By E. Lynn Linton. 3 vols. London: Chatto & Windus.

appears. He is punished by cold dishes which he knows might just as well have been kept hot, and by the meekly injured tone with which his wife rejects everything on the table—"I can't eat that, John, it is spoilt with waiting." Yet she is fond of her husband, too, in her own way; only she cannot resist the temptation to give him a taste of the discipline which she administers to the rest of the world. Great pains have also been taken with the character of Mr. Hamley, who is, if not the hero, the central figure of the story. He is described as a tall, full-fleshed man, with dark curled hair, and thick whiskers meeting in a frill under the chin, black, keen, deeply-set eyes, a large obtrusive nose, and heavy lips which, when open, show too much of the gums. "In his showy attitudes and parabolic gestures, in the measured accents of his level artificial voice, in the glitter of the massive gold chain across his ample front, the sparkle of the huge diamonds on his large hands, in the cleverly drawn parting of his shining hair down to the tips of his shining boots, and in the superb fineness and glossiness of his clothes, could be read the self-complacency of the man and the success of his life." He is a self-made man, "and glories in his Maker." Born in a hovel, he has worked his way up to be the chief man in Mill-town by a combination of good and bad qualities, by industry and business talents on the one side, and by cunning and servility on the other. Having set out in life with a determination to conquer society, he is careful not to offend it. "No one could remember an offensive word from him against his social superiors or the institutions of the country." With all his egotism, however, he is not unscrupulous. Self-respect makes him anxious to do the right thing to everybody, so that there shall be no risk of tarnish to his reputation. He married his wife, who was much older than himself, not for love, but because he wanted to get upon a higher social platform, and she was an Admiral's daughter, and was recognized in good society; but he has always been true to her, and has shown her every mark of respect and attention. On the other hand, however, this has not prevented his cherishing the thought of marrying Dora when his wife dies, as in the natural course of things she, being now an elderly woman in weak health, may be expected to do before long. He is content to wait, and he waits loyally and quietly, without giving any sign of his hopes. Though the man himself is coarse and vulgar in the grain, there are subtle and delicate touches in this picture of him which show a true perception of the complexities of human nature.

The leading idea of the story, it will be observed, is the conflict between the impulses of a sincere, fresh, and unsophisticated nature and the pretences and restraints of artificial society, and the description of this struggle is the best part of the book. Patricia in the end breaks down in the unequal contest. Touched by Dora's soft and sympathetic attentions, she unconsciously becomes the agent of the designing girl in passing a forged cheque, and, when the fraud is detected, refuses to say from whom she received the cheque. The Hamleys are in perplexity, and do not wish to bear hardly on her; but they do not know what to think. Patricia's life under the cloud of suspicion and disgrace becomes intolerable. She therefore seeks refuge with some friends in the village who believe in her innocence, and, after a time, marries a young sailor who had been her playmate at Barsands and who now opportunely reappears. While virtue is thus cast into the shade, Dora is triumphant in her wickedness. She is secretly married to Sydney Lowe, but when Hamley, immediately after his wife's death, proposes to her to become the mistress of Abbey Holme, she fondly accepts, and trusts to chance to enable her to escape from a perilous dilemma. The knot is cut by Sydney meeting Hamley in a wood and killing him by a sudden blow. Hamley had previously made a will, leaving all his wealth to Dora, and she and Sydney now share it together, with outward honour, but with wasting remorse at heart. A poacher who is found near the body of the slain man is hanged for the murder. Up to a certain point the character of Dora is finely drawn; her steady selfishness, her soft petting ways, her childish trust in things somehow turning out all right, and her readiness to take any side that suits the purpose of the moment, make up a portrait of which the counterpart may be found in real life; but her audacity is scarcely consistent with the general weakness of her nature, and her utter want of any kind of moral sense converts her into a fanciful creation. Of the other characters there is little to be said. The Lowes, father and son, are clever outlines only, which require filling up. There is an obvious artistic error in giving us only a glimpse of the young sailor, Patricia's devotion to whom is supposed to be her mainstay during her troubles; and the episode of the peasant proprietor, Garth, who is sold out of his farm, becomes poacher, and is hanged in error as Hamley's murderer, is rather clumsily and unnecessarily introduced as an excuse for one of those fantastic assaults on political economy in which Mrs. Linton is so fond of indulging. On the whole, the best parts of the book are its social pictures, which are sharp, vivid, and amusing.

#### MAYERS'S CHINESE READER'S MANUAL.\*

CHINA is a land of traditions. Its great antiquity as a nation, and the long roll of its history, have bequeathed to it a larger legacy of famous names and great or infamous deeds than

\* *The Chinese Reader's Manual: a Handbook of Biographical, Historical, Mythological, and General Literary Reference.* By William Frederick Mayers. London: Trübner & Co. 1874.

has fallen to the share of any other Empire. The mystic religions also which have held sway over the minds of the people for so many centuries have added, by way of supplement to the historical annals of the nation, a large quota of legendary literature, full of the sayings and doings of whole armies of gods and goddesses, of saints and ascetics, borrowed from the Indian mythology. Thus every Chinese writer has at his hand an inexhaustible fund of tradition from which he may draw illustrations, point warnings, or incite to noble deeds. At the same time the system of national education, which turns the mind of the student backwards instead of forwards, which holds up as examples of the highest excellence the sayings and doings of the sages and statesmen of antiquity, and which forces into action the memory rather than the intellect, tends to encourage in every book, in every essay, and in every poem references to the historical characters and events which form the principal study of all Chinese scholars.

Among European writers the practice of drawing illustrations from early historical or legendary sources is but an incident of style, but with the Chinese "it takes," as Mr. Mayers observes, "the character of a canon of literary art." So inexorable are the laws which bind Chinese authors to follow abjectly the footsteps of the ancients, that all independent flights of fancy or trains of thought are crushed out, and a dead level of stilted plagiarisms unrelieved by a single new idea or fresh expression is all that is left to represent the modern literature of the country. Thus forbidden to make any independent efforts towards excellence, they devote undue attention to petty tricks of style, and vie with one another in introducing allusions to historical and legendary events in intricate profusion. No one can read many pages of any Chinese work possessing pretensions to style without meeting with more or less covert references to the beauty of some Si She, the patriotism of some Su Wu, or the depravity of some Ta ki, all of which, being stock illustrations, are perfectly intelligible to every trained Chinese scholar, but are so many stumbling-blocks to the foreign student. It is true that biographical dictionaries contain the necessary information to make these plain, but it does not fall to the lot of every one to be within reach of the British Museum; and even if it did, the wearisome intricacy of the arrangements of Chinese books of reference is such as to deter any but the most resolute students from attempting to dive into their pages. The system on which they classify the contents of their encyclopedias, and the phonetic arrangement which rules the compilation of most of their biographical dictionaries, defy analysis. Who, for instance, would ever think of looking for the article on tigers under the heading of insects? or who would expect to find the syllables *my, chub, or kin*, arranged as rhyming with *chi*, when by the light of modern dictionaries other headings point to far more appropriate classification? The explanation of these last apparent inconsistencies is that modern editors insist on ignoring the changes which have gradually come over the pronunciation of the language, and on retaining the phonetic arrangement of the characters which was established when their sounds were first subjected to analysis. This is, no doubt, a fault we might expect to find among a people to whom every new invention is abhorrent; but let us hope that the introduction of steamers on their great water ways, and of telegraphs on their shores, will teach them enough of the value of time to induce them to adopt some system which will tend to lighten the labours at present imposed upon students by the clumsy arrangement of their books of reference.

The difficulties we have spoken of are best appreciated by those who have devoted most time to the study of Chinese literature, and to such the appearance of the work before us will be welcome. Mr. Mayers is one of the best Chinese scholars of the day, and he has enjoyed opportunities of study which may be envied by his less fortunate fellow-labourers in Europe. Of these opportunities he has taken every advantage, as the very wide range of reading which is implied in the compilation of his *Chinese Reader's Manual* fully proves. In it he has brought together from many and various sources "an epitome of historical and biographical details," together with a most useful list of many literary expressions which, unintelligible in themselves, become full of meaning when explained by the light of the event or legend from which they take their rise. The biographical portion of the work is compiled with great care and discretion, and embraces almost every Chinese celebrity of every age from the great Yu, who drained off the waters of the flood, to Hung Siu-tuan, the leader of the Tai-ping rebels, and Tseng Kwoh-fan, the late celebrated statesman and Viceroy. The details furnished in each case are full and accurate, and taken together they form a most interesting general picture of Chinese history. In them are reflected the rise and fall of the various dynasties, the revolutions which have from time to time shaken the Empire to the core, and the intrigues, common to all Oriental countries, of statesmen, favourites, and Court ladies recorded in the long drama of Chinese history.

In connexion with this part of the work Mr. Mayers has added a very useful index at the end of the volume, which will be of material value in enabling students to recognize the names of scholars and statesmen in the various disguises under which they appear in Chinese books. For, in addition to his patronymic and cognomen, every Chinaman of position adopts on his arriving at man's estate a literary name by which he is usually designated in familiar parlance or in literature. In addition to this he commonly takes one or more pseudonyms which he employs as *noms de plume*, and after his death, should he be considered worthy, he not unusually receives a posthumous title. By any one of these appellations a man may be designated, and hence the diffi-



culty of identifying authors and men of note is often considerable. To take one instance, the celebrated scholar *Mao K'i-ling* is very frequently spoken of in books as *Si-ho*—literally, Western river; and should the student be ignorant of this pseudonym, he has no means of discovering the patronymic of the person referred to. If he turns, however, to the character *Si* in Mr. Mayers's index, he will be at once referred to an entry on page 151 which contains the information that *Si-ho* was a pseudonym adopted by *Mao* whose cognomen was *K'i-ling* and whose literary name was *Ta-ko*.

In order to afford some idea of the explanations given by the author of the historical allusions so commonly met with in Chinese literature we will quote an entry taken at random from the first part of the work:—

Hung Yeh, the red leaf which led to a happy union. It is related that in the time of T'ang Hi Tsung, A.D. 874–888, a youth named Yu Yeo happening to pick up a crimson leaf which had fallen from a tree near the palace, idly inscribed upon it a quatrain offering his greeting to whomsoever might find it, and cast his billet into a stream which ran through the Imperial park. Here the leaf was wafted to the feet of a lady of the Court, who wrote a responsive verse on a similar leaf, which she threw into the brook, and which was carried by chance to Yu Yeo's hands. Shortly afterwards three thousand of the palace ladies were allowed, owing to the various disorders then prevailing, to seek husbands beyond the walls of the seraglio, and Yu Yeo, discovering the fair one with whom he had corresponded, became united to her in marriage.

The value of such an explanation is obvious. Without it the Hung Yeh would be to the student a red leaf, and nothing more, and thus the whole sense of a passage would be lost to him. So also in the case of the next entry. "The catastrophe of the red sheep" would be a hopeless enigma to a translator unless he had within his reach the information that the expression was intended to signify a period of great disaster. In fact, until now one or more of the vast and ill-arranged encyclopedias has been a necessary adjunct to the dictionary of the student. For the future the *Chinese Reader's Manual* will for all ordinary purposes be sufficient, and the relief of exchanging the unwieldy Chinese tomes for Mr. Mayers's handy little volume will be great.

The second part of the work is devoted to the elucidation of what the author calls the "numerical categories" so frequently employed by Chinese writers:—

In obedience [says Mr. Mayers], it would seem, to an impulse the influence of which is distinctly marked in the literary traditions of the Chaldeans, the Hebrews, and the Hindoos, a doctrine of the hidden properties and harmonies of numbers imbues the earliest recorded expressions of Chinese belief. . . . The dual form of animated life, the succession of the seasons, the alternation of day and night, the revolutions of the visible planets, may not improbably have given rise to a conception of numerical harmony obeying some mysterious and unchanging law, when contemplated by minds striving after the rudiments of knowledge, and absorbed in attempts to fathom the causes and order of existence.

This practice, which began by arranging numerically such things as the attributes of gods and men, the various forms of existence, and the heavenly bodies, is now applied to almost everything capable of division, and is used in a way which presupposes on the part of the reader an acquaintance with the historical part of the language which very few foreigners possess. Explanations are necessary, for instance, to make plain that such expressions as *San keae*, or *Sze shuh*, which mean literally "the three regions" and "the four arts," refer the one to the Taoist three regions of existence—namely, the Heavens, the Earth, and the Water; and the other to the four subjects of study during the Confucian period—namely, the Book of Odes, the Record of Rites, the Book of History, and the Book of Music. To help to clear away these difficulties, Mr. Mayers has brought together from native works bearing on the subject a fairly complete collection of these numerical categories, and has added to each a full interpretation of its meaning.

To these two parts the author has added a chronological list of the Emperors of China from the dawn of history to the year 1862, and has thus completed a very useful handbook on a very difficult subject. In justice to Mr. Mayers we are unwilling to close this notice without again bearing testimony to the erudition and care displayed by him in his present work. When the great difficulty, even to practised scholars like Mr. Mayers, of reading Chinese books written in all varieties of style is remembered, the fact of his having ransacked so large a section of Chinese literature from which to gather his materials marks him as a man of great industry as well as of extensive scholarship. The book is a thoroughly good one, and we confidently recommend it to every student of Chinese literature.

#### WALKER'S "ORIGINAL."\*

IT hardly needed a prefatory Memoir by Mr. Blanchard Jerrold to enhance the intrinsic interest of Walker's *Original*. Walker's father, it seems, as borough-reeve of Manchester, took a prominent part in the opposition to Pitt's Fustian Tax in 1784, and suffered for his independence and public spirit in various ways. For ourselves, however, the sketches of the father and son, prefixed to the *Original* proper, are chiefly interesting as showing not so much that "fortes creantur fortibus et bonis," as that the courage and rough good sense of the sire were mellowed and toned by education and reflection in the son. "Jacobin" Walker's lines were cast in stormy places, for which he was specially suited, while his son's more pleasant path lay in the direction of

social experiment and improvement. The scantiness of the materials which Mr. Jerrold has got together is shown by his being able to justify the reputation of the father as a humourist only by a solitary story of his putting himself in the place of a follower or policeman, and obtaining a turkey's leg from the benevolence of an "area-belle," and by his being driven to semi-allegorical introductions of "Porcus," "Jack Styles," and "our friend Wayward" to represent the opposition to the other Mr. Walker's high-health views. The truth is that the *Original* owes so much of its charm to its being purely introspective, and the writer's illustrations and experiments so unaffectedly introduce himself, that it enables us without going further to picture to ourselves very distinctly the police magistrate who divided himself between laborious days and social evenings, and who endeavoured to promote the public weal by practical experiments as to the diminution of pauperism, and also by practical attempts to simplify the science of "gastronomy," and who, by force of a pleasant style, well-chosen topics, engaging candour, and thorough *bonhomie*, succeeded in floating and keeping afloat, as long as he cared to do so, a weekly periodical which would have been creditable to a confederacy of writers. But if there is little in the introductory part of the new edition which might not be learnt from Hone's memoir of the father, or from the son's references to himself in the papers which are his standing memorial, it is not the less a welcome fact that the *Original* has reached a third edition. Stray second-hand copies have always commanded a high price, and personal experience has taught us that no borrowed book has been more difficult to recover. It is possible, therefore, that the new library edition will be gratefully received.

It might be too much to say that Walker from the beginning of his publication fully contemplated the sort of classical position which was in store for it, though his programme embraced the treatment of "whatever is most interesting and important in religion and politics, in morals and manners, and in our habits and customs," and though his aim was "to set before his readers an alternative diet of sound and comfortable doctrine." But within three months it occurred to his correspondents "to wish him all the success of the *Spectator*, *Tatler*, and *Guardian*;" and in truth the chief distinction between the *Original* and those earlier and more famous serials lies in the more practical and work-a-day tone of the former. Not that Walker is deficient in humour, or wit, or pleasantry. His writings display all these qualities combined with a genuine philanthropy and a transparent candour which make them interesting alike to the would-be reformer of society and to the casuist who delights in self-inspection. Every now and then he indulges in a quiet irony, as, for instance, where, on the topic of Domestic Economy, he combats the objection to cottagers having orchards "as affording a cover for stealing and selling the farmers' apples," by the argument that "robbing orchards would probably be held in greater disrepute when some of the class who are now the offenders might themselves suffer from the practice"; or where, as a plea for Clubs, and in reply to the objection of the ladies that they are anti-matrimonial and adverse to domestic habits, he suggests that "they are a preparation, and not a substitute, for domestic life." He has a keen eye, too, in his anecdotes, for the ludicrous, as in the story of the Cambridge Wrangler's attempt to cross the Alps mathematically resulting in broken bones. The form and size of the weekly issue admitted of what now would be called "occasional notes," and there is scarcely one of these which does not supply an illustration or a *mot*.

There is no denying that the fame of the *Original* has rested hitherto on the essays on the "Art of attaining High Health" and the "Art of Dining." Perhaps it has even been heightened by the knowledge of the fact that one who had reduced both these arts to a matter of the nicest adjustment and certainty, so that he could afford occasionally to exceed, and who lived without medicine, without greatcoat, without fear of weather for sixteen years, did no better than less regular men, and died at fifty from damaged lungs and liver. He was not the man to endorse the cant phrase "Do as I say, not as I do"; he believed that he had mastered the secret of physical self-knowledge; but he miscalculated the powers of his machine. To those who avail themselves of a fresh opportunity of studying the *Original* its author will, we suspect, appear quite as sagacious on questions of pauperism, parochial government, thrift and domestic economy, savings banks, and such like topics, as on those directly affecting his stomach and his digestion. As to the latter, social changes have made some remarks read like anachronisms; but it is curious to find how much of what he lays down as to the former is in accordance with our most successful social reforms. His remarks on the Regulation of Charity foreshadowed a reform which a partial attempt has been made to carry out. His hints as to the teaching of domestic economies (ii. 74–5)—

To market and make purchases on the most advantageous terms; to apply the arts of cookery to preparing food in an economical, wholesome, and palatable manner; to brew and bake; to light a fire expeditiously and economically; to keep a fire economically; to make a fire cheerful economically; to set out the table quickly and neatly; to clear away expeditiously; to cut out, mend, and make linen, and to keep other clothes in good order; to wash and get up linen; to sweep and clean rooms, and to keep them neat and comfortable—

are anticipatory, by a score of years at least, of the movement in favour of the teaching of "common things." With peculiar opportunities of observation Mr. Walker arrived at the opinion that it was of little or no use to attempt to eradicate depravity when once contracted, that prison discipline was powerless in the way of reformation, and that the true and Christian way to deter from

\* The *Original*. By Thomas Walker, M.A. Edited by Blanchard Jerrold. 2 vols. London: Grant & Co. 1874.

crime was to make the sweets of liberty and independence more patent and attractive. Along with such views would naturally follow a dead set against pauperism. In his experience there was no such thing as *isolated destitution*; and he held more strongly than even many of our present social reformers that there is nothing so demoralizing in its tendencies as casual and indiscriminate charity. He did not believe in the cry of "we've got no work to do":—

There is a market for all sorts of services at all sorts of prices. Individuals of defective intellect have a value at a certain class of public-houses by way of butt, and very often at farm-houses, for something of the same reason, and to have thrown on them the lowest and most disagreeable offices. Lameness is a good guarantee for faithful discharge of duties of a stationary and gentle nature, and age the same. Misfortune is often a sort of fortune in obtaining a preference for pity's sake, as a person with one arm will be selected from a number of competitors to hold a horse. If all persons felt obliged to hawk about their services for the best price they could get, all persons would be provided for.—ii. p. 191.

There is little doubt that the police magistrate based this belief on a very copious induction. As regards parochial government, he is in favour of the principle of self-government by small communities, as calculated to call the social principles into action. His development of the "Prytaneum" plan would doubtless scandalize modern purists and reformers; but there is a good deal in what he says elsewhere:—

You must either have tavern bills or attorney's bills. The public has no way of being so well served as by furnishing good cheer, though the public, or those who call themselves the public, do not seem to think so just at present.—ii. p. 330.

But, to come to his best known articles on the Art of Dining, the Art of Travel, and the Art of attaining High Health, it is evident that their piquancy is due to the mixture of sound sense and truth at bottom with a dash or two of extravagance and enthusiasm. It is unnecessary to accept all the marvels which he connects with a perfected digestion, although one may clearly discern the dependence of mental and bodily alacrity with its opposite, nervousness, upon the healthy or unhealthy state of the digestive powers; and although to the same disposing cause most men would refer ease and spontaneity in composition. "The difference," writes Mr. Walker, "between the best and worst humour for composition is like that between a salient fountain and a crazy pump in a deep well." If it be so, the gain of a good digestion is worth seeking, even if it fall short of the bodily purity (under adverse conditions) which Dr. Gregory confirms Mr. Walker in declaring to result from the active exhalation from the surface of an animal in perfect health, and of which the outward sign with the author of the *Original* was a clean foot and stocking, though the road traversed were ever so dusty. The way and means lay in a strict dietary till the constitution was brought into trim. Moderate and timely rations of food were to be accompanied by sips, not gulps, of liquid, whether stimulant or otherwise. On Shakespeare's principle that "unquiet meals make ill digestions," disagreeable subjects were to be banned from the meal-times, and agreeable topics chosen in order to stimulate the salivary glands by promoting mastication. Early rising, unhurried dressing, ample preparation, and exercise short of fatigue, are prescribed as conducive to the good digestion which, according to Walker, has more influence on the feelings than the heart, to the door of which so many sins are laid; but, before all else, we take it, he would have prescribed a social meal, as distinguished on the one hand from the solitary repast, and on the other from the set or state dinner or breakfast. As animals which have been used to feed in company fall off if placed alone, so, our essayist argued, and not without a good show of reason, solitary meals generate indigestion, and where they are inevitable the evil should be minimized by prefatory relaxation of the mind, and by such methodical service that everything should be ready to hand, and nothing have to be waited for. It is evident, too, that equally objectionable to Mr. Walker's taste was the "set dinner," for the most unpractical of all his suggestions in the "Art of Dining" are two which are intended to mitigate the objections to a numerous company on the same day. He proposes, first, to divide them into two or more tables; and, secondly, to let one section of a family entertain their guests at four o'clock, and another detachment hold its feast at the same table at seven, all meeting in the drawing-room at a later period of the evening. It is hard to see how the one scheme could be compassed without duplicate hosts, or the other without a succession of cooks and attendants. But the author of the *Original's* heart (or, as he would have maintained, his digestion) was devoted to the social meal, and—barring one or two crotchets—he will always be regarded here as a great authority. How sound are his dicta about lighting and laying the social dinner-table! Instead of cumbrous branches on the table, a subdued light should be shed on it, as in some of Rembrandt's paintings, either from the wall, or, as he prescribes in reference to a winter dinner party of nine or seven, by seating two or three on each side of the table, the host at the top, and at the bottom only the fire with the lights on the mantelpiece. By this method a capital light is obtained, and, as Mr. Walker puts it cheerily, "the fire is made one of the party." And then as regards the adjuncts of each course; how convenient to have the decanters to your hand, and duplicates of the lobster sauce, cucumber, and cayenne, and Chili vinegar within reach, and without risk of collapse in the process of handing over your shoulder! Something of this convenience is realized in the reduplication of cream jugs, sugar basins, and the like at modern breakfast-tables. Every dish, says our *Amphitryon* of 1835, should

be served with its proper accompaniments and its appropriate vegetable, a pause intervening between each for wine and talk. With an eye to the repast and not to the pageant, the woodcock should precede the joint, and the wines be circulated early in the meal. "Where the champagne goes right nothing can well go wrong." There are some absurdities, we grant, in his excessive theory of "self-helping"; e.g. where he recommends a bread-basket for a centre-piece; and some complaints are laid at the door of State dinner-parties, which no longer apply; for example, the ignorance "what there is to eat" is obviated by the fashion of "cartes." But, after all this lapse of years, Mr. Walker's instincts as to dining and catering (socially, and not in state) are as wholesome and sound as ever; and though we may not be prepared to forego, in the adoption of his views, the dinner *à la Russe*, which was undreamed of in his earlier philosophy, the details in these pleasant volumes of his menus "for three" on Christmas Day, "for six" in the Temple, and for seven or eight at Blackwall, convince us that a man might do worse than take part, whenever he has the chance, in a dinner *à la Walker*.

#### VANESSA.\*

THOSE young ladies whose delight it is to read about falling into love and out of love may possibly find some pleasure in *Vanessa*. There are in it three heroines who are seven times in love; who have, if we are not mistaken, eight proposals made to them, though not always from the seven gentlemen from whom they would have desired it; and get four times married. The leading heroine, Amy Mertoun, is first in love with Dennis O'Brien, then with Lord Alan Rae, whom she marries. On her widowhood she is again in love with O'Brien, who is no longer in love with her, and last of all she is in love with George Charlton, who happily is in love with her. Her sister Helen is far more constant, for all through the story she is in love with O'Brien alone, though he for a long while is in love with Amy. She has meanwhile a couple of lovers to console her, though, being of a scientific cast of mind, she cares far less for them than for the beetles of which she is making an interesting collection. The cousin of these two young ladies, Eva Mertoun, is in love with Lord Alan, but fortunately for her she is jilted by him for her prettier cousin Amy. Falling out of love with him, she presently falls into love with her cousin Henry, the brother of Amy and Helen. So Lord Alan is in love, so far as a wicked nobleman who has a taint of insanity in the blood can be in love, first with Eva and then with Amy. Dennis is in love first with Amy and then with Helen, while poor Henry, having only one cousin but two sisters, has no choice but to be constant. As for George Charlton, we take no account of him. He is brought in just at the end, that Helen might discover that O'Brien is no longer in love with her sister Amy, and so might desert her beetles and show her long-concealed affection. Even without the wicked nobleman there is, as our readers will admit, a very liberal allowance of love-making for two volumes. With him thrown in, the author might, if she had pleased, with the greatest propriety have made her tale half as long again. These stories in two volumes have, we are ready to admit, certain merits of their own. We think, however, that the respect which is due to the aristocracy requires that when a marquis's family is introduced a third volume should always be added. More especially is this the case when it is a family that has had a taint in its blood for many generations, and can boast of men who are nearly all vicious or insane. We would as soon see an heir to a marquise on his marriage-day drive off with his bride with only a pair of horses to his carriage as have him make love in only two volumes.

The two heroines, Amy and Helen Mertoun, are the daughters of a widow lady who has been left in very reduced circumstances. Helen accepts her lot cheerfully; but, as she remarks to her mother, "Amy never seems quite congenial with the family atmosphere." Her mother, by way of apology, replies, "Poor child! she is able to remember when the atmosphere was very different." Amy has a young lover, Dennis O'Brien, who is scarcely more satisfied with his lot, but soon announces, "I am perhaps absurdly elated at the prospect of being transferred to a more congenial atmosphere." He gets into a more congenial atmosphere by being transferred from "bank drudgery" to the curatorship of a museum, while she at the same time also gets a change of atmosphere, as she goes to live with a rich uncle as a companion to his only child Eva. O'Brien, in the elation produced by this atmospheric change, pointing out to her that the museum is close to her uncle's house, exclaims, "The Fates have ordained that we should not be separated." She, however, has her doubts whether her rich uncle will care to see her poor friends, and says, "I shall not venture to invite my acquaintance to his house." O'Brien replies in a speech not unworthy of the immemorial stage-lover. "True, your acquaintance. I should decline to enter his doors if I am to be designated by so cold a term. But what if I come as your affianced lover?" Amy lets him know that their positions are changed with the atmosphere, and that their "present relations cannot continue." "I understand," said Dennis, fixing his eyes on Amy with an expression of indignant scorn, before which she quailed; "we are to exercise the right of free choice in our separate spheres." This scene occurred in a walk in the country, where her young brother and sister had gone with them to play

\* *Vanessa*. By the Author of "Thomasina," "Dorothy," &c. 2 vols. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1874.



propriety. The boy was as fond of natural history as O'Brien himself, and at this moment came running up to ask if he had found any specimens. "Remember," he said, "that you promised me the first Painted Lady of the season." Nothing could have come in more pat to bring the first act to a close, and O'Brien shows that he can profit by such an opportunity. "This is not Vanessa Cardui, but a new variety," he said, "a Painted Lady which has just left the chrysalis and intends to soar above us earth-worms." "Where is it? Let me see; have you let it go?" said Dick, surveying O'Brien's empty palm with a puzzled air. "I have let it go," repeated O'Brien quietly.

Amy goes to her rich uncle, and at once plunges into fashionable company. Among others she meets with Lord Alan Rae, who has been paying attentions for some while to her cousin Eva. He can talk as well as the rest of them, and Amy, as she overheard "a dialogue" between him and Eva, must have felt that, while as an heir to a marquise he was so much superior, as an orator he was not inferior even to Dennis O'Brien. "Her exuberant energies," he says, in speaking of his aunt Lady Cecilia, "absorb the vital forces of those with whom she comes in contact, leaving my spirit altogether arid; but under cover of your music the sponge is removed, and I am myself again." Presently he begins to find Amy more attractive than Eva, and deserts the one cousin for the other. Mr. Mertoun learns for the first time that he has been paying attentions to his daughter, and, aware as he is of the taint of blood in this noble family, and of the insanity or viciousness of all the male members, forbids her to think anything more of him. Everything therefore favours Amy. Her sister Helen meanwhile comes to visit her. Though this young lady is but sixteen, she can talk as well as his Lordship or as Dennis O'Brien. "It is a grand resource," she says, "to have a definite pursuit. Botany and beetles will satisfy my aspirations for the next ten years." She does not get on well with her more worldly-minded sister. "The truth is that Amy and I survey life from different planes, and you cannot live with such an unconventional pair of sisters for six weeks without being disabused of your ideal of family harmony." Her cousin Eva, who is at least one year older, is not unworthy of her. "Life," she says, "is a series of disillusion; one more or less cannot signify." We are not surprised that "Amy never seemed quite congenial with the family atmosphere"—if, that is to say, in the family atmosphere the family talk is included. By her love of beetles and of fine words Helen is clearly marked out for Dennis, though, as she is only sixteen at the time that we are writing about, she has to wait till the very end of the novel before even a proposal can be made her. When her sister meets her at the station to take her to their uncle's house, she says:—"I began to work my fingers into the trammels of civilization when I reached the Bixley Junction, in order that I might display them to you in unsullied glory." When this is translated into unheroic English, it means that she had not put on her new pair of gloves till her railway journey was close at its end. No wonder that the fashionable Amy, if she admired the language, yet scorned the carefulness, of her younger sister:—

Amy smiled at the thought that if Dennis O'Brien were destined to be the crumpled rose-leaf in her lot, any annoyance he might cause her was cheaply purchased by her immunity from such sordid economies. She laid a disapproving finger on Helen's neck-tie, the only article of her dress, with the exception of the gloves aforesaid, which bore any appearance of newness, and asked "Where did you buy that gaudy thing? It goes very ill with your dress."

"I did not buy it at all, Amy: it was an offering of esteem and regard from Mr. Benson, when I went about my last lot of work. I had an impression that it was rather vulgar, but as he assured me it was a sweet, genteel thing, I could not hurt his feelings by declining the gift."

"At all events you might keep it for Allerton church; you will not meet Mr. Benson here."

"That is true," said Helen, as she took off the obnoxious ribbon and slipped it into her pocket; "you see how amenable I am, but you must not be too critical of my manners and appearance, or I shall become still more awkward than I am by nature. Is not this Swiss cottage which has broken out in chimnies the lodge to Leasowes? please put my bonnet straight while I compose myself into a becoming attitude of lady-like ease, and assume my very properest behaviour."

The two sisters have a brother Henry, not unworthy of them, who made remarks sardonically. He is a bosom-friend of Dennis, who confides to him that "the glamour of the old days has departed," and a determined enemy of the wicked Lord. This misguided nobleman, however, is in the end of the greatest service to both the young men. For, if he had not made love to Amy, she might have become reconciled with Dennis. In that case he would not have married Helen, who, from her taste for big words and beetles, alone was worthy of him. And if he had not run away with Amy, he would have married Eva, and so Henry would have lost his wife. When Mr. Mertoun first suspects an attachment between his daughter and Lord Alan, he sends her away with Amy to Swanage. Eva, on hearing that she was to go, "listened with a tightening of the heart," but Amy, finding that Lord Alan at once proposed to go yachting on the south coast, "exulted in such a proof of the futility of the machinations which had been devised to estrange her from her noble lover." He now appears, but he appears no longer as the noble lover, but as the wicked nobleman with whom heroines are only too familiar. He has "a shade of haughtiness in his tone." He carries off Amy in his yacht. As they were embarking from the pier, "they were a mark for curious glances from the knot of idlers who were gathered there." A cat may look at a king, but not, it would seem, holiday folks at the heir to a marquise. "It was evident that Lord Alan observed

and resented the inquisition, and he waved off with a haughty air the officious help of those who wished to lend a hand in pushing off the boat." Perhaps, as he was a Scotchman, and a poor Scotchman, he may have thought that, if he accepted help, he would have to pay for it. The yacht is carried the same day into port, and the pair of lovers hasten up to London. They are pursued by Dennis, who compels the wicked nobleman, quite contrary to his intentions, to marry Amy that same day. How that is managed, as she was under age, and had not her mother's consent, is known only to his lordship's banker, to whom he went "to take the necessary steps for procuring a special licence." "I am to marry you," he said to his bride, with something like a sneer. "You and O'Brien have elected that it is so to be." He talks indeed so finely to his wife that she must have thought the atmosphere, so far as words are concerned, very like that to which she had been always used. Before long he goes mad, and behaves to her one night in such an extraordinary manner that "her maid could see that the pale gold colour of her hair had been streaked with silver by the mental agony of the last few hours."

Meanwhile all the good people of the story who were content with poverty, and whose simple tastes were satisfied with fine words, are rewarded by getting rich and by falling into love with each other. Even the mercenary Amy is forgiven in the end for having "elected" to marry a nobleman, and is rewarded by the hand of an honest farmer. "The conversation," we read in one part of the story, where a dinner party is described, "rippled away to other subjects." If conversation can ripple away, we do not see why writing should not ripple also. In that case we would express a wish that the present silly fashion of novel-writing would ripple away till it soon ended, not in other subjects, but in a perfect calm.

#### GERMAN LITERATURE.

THE great work in which Herr W. Corssen\* essays the final solution of the riddle of the origin of the Etruscans will, if the author's conclusions are established, close one of the most remarkable chapters in the history of philological and ethnological research. It will in that case be impossible henceforth to regard this mysterious people as aught but a branch of the Latin race, nor will the grievous loss to the imaginative faculty be compensated either by anything striking in the manner of the discovery itself or brilliant in the contributions accruing to our actual stock of knowledge. Herr Corssen's results are the conquests of patience and sagacity rather than of genius; in working out his theory he has but corroborated the conclusions of a long line of ingenious predecessors. Nor will the most accurate interpretations of inscriptions restricted to a few words, for the most part proper names, promote the reconstruction of an extinct civilization or afford the key to a buried literature. Corssen offers the imagination no equivalent for what he takes away, and hence his views will only be accepted with difficulty and reluctance. The most hostile, however, must acknowledge that his speculations, even if erroneous, are not fantastic or visionary. One need not be an Etruscan scholar to recognize not merely the caution and sobriety of the man, but the coherence and consecutiveness of the system. The more we read the more deeply we are impressed with the author's erudition, and still more with his easy control over what so many would have found an unmanageable mass of material. The impression goes on deepening until we are ready to credit anything rather than that one so temperate, so thorough, so painstaking, so completely the antipodes of all that is flighty or fantastic in philology, should have persuaded himself into the advocacy of an utter delusion. We can only offer the merest outline of an argument addressed to the most select of critical tribunals. The investigator commences with the study of the Etruscan alphabet, and directs his reasoning to establish its affinity to the other Italian alphabets, and the common derivation of all from the Phœnician. He next addresses himself to the inscriptions, and in the first instance to such as, the transliteration once ascertained, cast some light on the structure of the language, whether from being accompanied by a Latin version, or from containing the names of deities or heroes whose Greek or Roman equivalents are known. He then discusses the inscriptions which afford no such clue, and, endeavouring to elucidate their meaning on the hypothesis of their Italian affinities, is led to bestow a most laborious and minute investigation on their grammatical forms, nominal, pre-nominal, and verbal. To follow his argument will require such a knowledge of the more archaic forms of Italian speech as is probably possessed by few scholars beside himself. Of the suffrage of the initiated he seems assured; the uninitiated perhaps will long continue to entertain scruples, and, while admiring, to distrust the ingenuity which contrives to discover Latin affinities for words at first sight so utterly alien to all familiar speech. The instinctive conclusion that the peculiar civilization of the Etruscans cannot have been Italian, that it must have been exotic, and may have been Oriental, is one which it will take philology long to dispel. Herr Corssen is not expected to take cognizance of any considerations external to the sphere of philology, but even in strictly linguistic investigations it is not safe to disdain the suggestions of unsophisticated common sense. He will find it difficult to repel Mr. Taylor's recent home-thrust by convincing any one of plain un-

\* *Ueber die Sprache der Etrusker.* Von W. Corssen. Bd. I. Leipzig: Teubner. London: Asher & Co.

understanding that when a particular word is followed by a numeral, it indeed means "aged," but that when its meaning is not thus ascertained beyond doubt, it must be understood as "the name of a sculptor." *Non sic itur ad astra*. The unriddlers of Egyptian and Assyrian mysteries have needed to resort to no such transparent subterfuges. How far this flaw may vitiate Professor Corssen's entire argument we cannot here attempt to determine. It will further be felt that the physical aspect of the question is most important, and that a satisfactory explanation of the abnormal but lifelike physiognomies of the Etruscan pair depicted on the sarcophagus in the British Museum must be an indispensable complement to the evidence derived from philology. A considerable step would be made if, instead of assuming with Niebuhr and Corssen that the Etruscans entered Italy from the North, we could discover grounds for relying on the ancient tradition which derives them from Asia Minor. In this case we should have an Asiatic people speaking a Pelasgic language, a conclusion in which the now seemingly discordant lines of testimony might happily unite. In addition to his main argument, Corssen's work contains most interesting chapters on the supposed dialects of Etruscan (Rhaetian, Etrurian, Campanian); the Greek words adopted into the language; and the locality and history of the principal archaeological discoveries hitherto made. Enormous as his volume appears, it is far from exhausting the subject. A second of equal dimensions is stated to be ready for the press.

The first volume of Professor Lefmann's translation of the *Lalita Vistara*\*, or Sanscrit life of Buddha, embraces only the first book. This is somewhat alarming, if, as we imagine, there are eleven more to come; and those who may resort to the work in the hope of learning something authentic about one of the greatest of philanthropists and reformers will experience much disappointment on discovering that this part contains nothing but the idle tales and fantastic imaginations of the Buddhist monks respecting Buddha's residence in the Tushita heaven before his miraculous conception, which are of no value except as evidence of the depth of the impression created by him. Better things may be expected to follow, and Professor Lefmann's notes, distinguished by great copiousness and erudition, no doubt constitute a valuable mine of information for the Buddhist specialist. He appears from his preface to have laid a good foundation for his labours by a greatly improved recension of the *Lalita Vistara*, the text of the Calcutta edition being, as he states, exceedingly defective. Siamese and Chinese versions of this Buddhist classic are respectively the bases of the valuable labours of Mr. Alabaster and Mr. Beal, which the English inquirer will for the present do well chiefly to consult. The perspicuity of these abridgments, contrasted with the unmanageable ponderousness of the original, is as good an instance as we know of *ὁσον πλεον ἡμισυ παντός*.

The second volume of A. von Vivenot's edition of the diplomatic correspondence of the Austrian Government † during the wars of the French Revolution comprises about four hundred documents, from April 1792 to March 1793. It is not inferior in interest to its predecessor, but seems no better calculated to promote the editor's object of rehabilitating the reputation of his country as affected by the events of this unfortunate period. All that can be said is that Austria does not appear to have been more selfish, treacherous, mistrustful, or imbecile than her rival. Both States were terribly afraid of taking more than their share in the operations against the common enemy, and desperately jealous of Russia, whom they suspected, with good ground, of egging them on with a view of meanwhile helping herself to Poland. The volume concludes with the second partition of that unfortunate country; the hypocrisy of the proclamations and other official documents relating to it is almost more revolting than the iniquity of the act. Many of the papers here printed are extremely piquant as well as important; such as the Austrian memorandum on the advantages of exchanging the Low Countries (which she could not keep) for Bavaria; and the conference between the victorious *sans-culotte* and the beaten Prussian general, in which the present positions of the parties are completely reversed.

A great "find" of the correspondence of the poet Bürger ‡ has occasioned the publication of four huge volumes of that ambiguous class which nobody thinks it worth while to buy, but which many will be glad of the opportunity of consulting. Bürger's own literary repute, though considerable, is hardly adequate to so very massive a monument; the illustrations of the literary history of the time are less numerous and important than we should have expected; and the intrinsic merits of the letters are not remarkable. The best are those from Biester, afterwards Royal Librarian at Berlin, a man apparently of such vivacity and enthusiasm that one marvels to find him an ally of the prosaic Nicolai. The epistles of Bürger's Mentor, Boie, also possess considerable interest as illustrative of the gradual progress of Bürger's poems from the first draught to maturity, and are attractive from the sterling character of the writer. Bürger's own disposition is depicted with considerable liveliness; he appears good-hearted, disinterested, genial, devoted to letters; but irregular, impulsive, unrefined in his habits, and

always in more or less of a scrape. The scandalous details of his third marriage should have been suppressed. Herr Strodtmann's excuse for reproducing them is a very lame one. The circle of his intimate friends comprises few distinguished names, and the literary movement of the time, active as it was, is now chiefly important in an historical point of view. Goethe is an exception of course, but his correspondence with Bürger is unimportant. There are nevertheless many interesting indications of the tendencies of the period. English literature was beginning to exercise a marked influence on Germany. Shakspeare is frequently mentioned with enthusiasm; he and Plato formed at one time Biester's whole library. The Percy Relics were widely known and even more influential; Bürger's ballads would never have been written without them; and they clearly deposited the seeds which subsequently ripened into the Romantic School. The veneration of the young men for Klopstock is quite touching. On the whole, this voluminous correspondence will well repay inspection, although its chief value may be as a substratum for the biography of Bürger which Herr Strodtmann announces as in preparation. The letters to Bürger are much more numerous than those from him, although many of the latter exist in rough draughts, and Herr Strodtmann's diligence has recovered others from the hands of autograph collectors. The great mass of the correspondence came at Bürger's death into the possession of a former biographer, who, terrified at its amount, left it totally unused, and it has only recently come to light after a series of adventures.

Professor Teichmüller's "Studies on the History of Ideas" \* are a valuable contribution to the history of ancient philosophy. The plan of the work is that of an inquiry into the precise signification attached by the Greek philosophers to the expressions employed by them. Their conceptions of final causes, optimism, immortality, and similar problems are successively discussed, the object not being to test the value of their opinions, but to determine what they were. Aristotle and Plato claim by far the larger part of the volume, but there is an interesting chapter on the physical theories of Anaximenes.

The strictly logical form of Dr. Seydel's treatise on Ethics † renders it only intelligible to those versed in the study of formal logic. The author's earnestness and moderation are conspicuous even amid his technicalities, and the abstruseness of his treatise consists much less in his style than his method.

In treating psychology "from the empirical point of view," Dr. F. Brentano ‡ signifies his adherence in the main to the English school, and enters upon a course of investigation which Germany is beginning to recognize as more promising of results than that hitherto followed.

The eight mediæval itineraries of the Holy Land § published by the indefatigable Tobler range from the eighth to the fourteenth century. Most of them have been already published in Wright's *Travels in the Middle Ages* and similar collections. The pilgrimage of St. Willibald, who visited Palestine in the eighth century, is the most important on account of its antiquity, and the furthest removed from a mere catalogue of names and places.

The principal novelty in Dr. Jacob's dissertation on the import of Dante's three guides in the other world ||—Virgil, Beatrice, and St. Bernard—is an endeavour to bring the ascent to higher spheres depicted in the poem into connexion with the actual development of Dante himself.

The "pictures of German culture" ¶ exhibited by Herr Kriegk hardly place that culture in the most advantageous point of view, being chiefly derived from the criminal archives of Frankfurt. They relate accordingly to such picturesque but unedifying episodes as abductions, secret poisonings, mercenary baptisms of knavish Jews, and proofs of the general venality of Frankfurt Senators during the first half of the eighteenth century. One transaction is exceedingly amusing; it is the prosecution of a tradesman who had endeavoured to repair his shattered fortunes by promising to betray the city to the French, but who, having respect to the possibility of detection, drew up beforehand a paper to be produced in case of such an event, protesting that his purpose was by no means to abet the enemy, but to swindle him. Nearly all these narratives are worth preserving, and all are well told. The second half of the volume is devoted to a history of Goethe's legal career at Frankfurt, while he yet followed the profession of an advocate. The memorials and other documents drawn up by him in this capacity are still extant, and exhibit, in Herr Kriegk's opinion, unequivocal traces of his style. They are sufficiently dry notwithstanding, Goethe's good sense forbidding him to be poetical out of place. The editor considers, however, that they are distinguished by a certain breadth of view and disposition to recur to first principles, which may be accounted for either by Goethe's superiority to mere legal technicalities or by his ignorance of them.

\* *Studien zur Geschichte der Begriffe*. Von G. Teichmüller. Berlin: Weidmann. London: Asher & Co.

† *Ethik oder Wissenschaft vom Seinsollenden*. Neu begründet und im Umriss ausgeführt von Dr. P. R. Seydel. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel. London: Asher & Co.

‡ *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkte*. Von Dr. F. Brentano. Bd. 1. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. London: Asher & Co.

§ *Descriptiones Terræ Sanctæ ex sæculo VIII., IX., XII. et XV.* Nach Hand- und Druckschriften. Herausgegeben von Titus Tobler. Leipzig: Hinrichs. London: Williams & Norgate.

|| *Die Bedeutung der Führer Dante's in der Divina Commedia*. Von Dr. J. Jacob. Leipzig: Hinrichs. London: Williams & Norgate.

¶ *Deutsche Kulturbilder aus dem achtzehnten Jahrhundert. Nebst einem Anhang: Goethe als Rechtsanwalt*. Von G. L. Kriegk. Leipzig: Hirzel. London: Williams & Norgate.

\* *Lalita Vistara. Erzählung von dem Leben und der Lehre des Çakya Sîkha*. Zuerst ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit Erklärungen versehen von Dr. S. Lefmann. Berlin: Dümmler. London: Asher & Co.

† *Quellen zur Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserpolitik Oesterreichs während der französischen Revolutionskriege*. Herausgegeben von Alfred Ritter von Vivenot. Bd. 2. Wien: Braumüller. London: Williams & Norgate.

‡ *Briefe von und an Gottfried August Bürger*. Aus dem Nachlasse Bürger's und anderen, meist handschriftlichen Quellen, herausgegeben von Adolf Strodtmann. 4 Bde. Berlin: Paetel. London: Williams & Norgate.



Beethoven, Liszt, Wagner\*, are notoriously Professor Nohl's *dii majores*, and the ceaseless glorification of them in his collected essays must be wearisome even to those who share his predilections to the full. It would have been judicious to intersperse something relating to composers of a lighter strain and more universal acceptance, the constantly aggressive attitude of a thoroughgoing champion of an unpopular or at least unacknowledged style being extremely unpropitious to the soothing influence generally reckoned among the most precious attributes of music. Dr. Nohl, however, always writes ably, and his review of a rival biographer's, Thayer's, Life of Beethoven, is especially valuable from his intimate knowledge of the subject.

"Old England and Shakspeare"† is the first volume of a comprehensive work on Shakspeare by a highly accomplished man—clear-headed, sensible, easy and fluent in diction, and exceedingly well informed on all subjects relating to mediæval and Tudor England. The first half of the book is occupied with an historical introduction to the study of Shakspeare, treating of the national development up to Elizabeth's time, the characteristics of that age of exuberant vigour, the previous history of the English language and literature, and the dramatic precursors of Shakspeare. The second book contains an inquiry into the circumstances of Shakspeare's education and the characteristics of his style; an endeavour to delineate his moral and intellectual character; an account of his epic poems and sonnets; and a criticism on the especially dramatic side of his genius. The separate examination of his plays is reserved for another volume. In general, the author appears as a mediator between the English and German schools of criticism; the former he thinks deserving more credit than they have received from the latter, whose admiration, if not to be called excessive, is at least too indiscriminate and unchastened. In discussing the Sonnets he adopts the view of their being addressed to a plurality of persons, and lays no stress upon the expression "only begetter" in the publisher's dedication.

Friedrich Spielhagen's‡ collection of odds and ends will do no discredit to his reputation, although the pieces are for the most part exceedingly slight. They are principally sketches of travel, although a little story turning upon an application for a situation is the most entertaining thing in the book.

Two novelettes by Robert Waldmüller§ deserve unusual praise. The scene of one, a perfect little comedy in a narrative form, is laid in Normandy; the other depicts the life of a rustic community about the middle of last century with spirit and feeling.

Though not strictly a German book, Mr. Campbell's *Annales de la Typographie Néerlandaise*|| deserves a word of notice from its relation to a cognate literature. Mr. Campbell has inspected and minutely described nearly two thousand productions of the Dutch press in the fifteenth century, half of which are in his own keeping in the Royal Library at the Hague. Many of these are tracts or fly-sheets of the greatest rarity, and not unfrequently of the utmost literary or historical interest. The intellectual activity of Holland at so early a period is exceedingly remarkable, and Mr. Campbell's labours are of the highest importance as a contribution to bibliography.

\* *Beethoven, Liszt, Wagner. Ein Bild der Kunstbewegung unseres Jahrhunderts.* Von Prof. Ludwig Nohl. Wien: Braumüller. London: Williams & Norgate.

† *Altengland und William Shakspeare.* Von H. Freiherrn von Friesen. Wien: Braumüller. London: Williams & Norgate.

‡ *Aus meinem Skizzenbuche.* Von F. Spielhagen. Leipzig: Staackmann. London: Williams & Norgate.

§ *Leid und Lust. Neue Novellen* von R. Waldmüller. Stuttgart: Cotta. London: Williams & Norgate.

|| *Annales de la Typographie Néerlandaise au XV. siècle.* Par M. F. A. G. Campbell. La Haye: Nijhoff. London: Asher & Co.

#### NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

#### THE UNITED STATES.

The Annual Subscription to the SATURDAY REVIEW, including postage to any part of the United States, is £1 10s. 6d., or \$7 50 gold, and may be forwarded direct to the Publisher, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, or to Mr. B. F. STEVENS, American Agency, 17 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London. International Money Orders can be sent from any office in the United States, and Subscriptions, payable in advance, may commence at any time.

#### PARIS.

Copies of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained every Saturday of M. FOTHERINGHAM, 8 Rue Neuve des Capucines.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday Mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any Newsgent, on the day of publication.

## THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 995, NOVEMBER 21, 1874:

Mr. Gladstone and the Liberal Party. The Prospects of Bonapartism.  
The Reform Conference. The Population of France. The Railway War.  
The London Gas Question. Scotland and Church Establishments.  
Recruiting.  
Further Replies to Mr. Gladstone.  
Metrical Tests. Brescia. Plain Cooks.  
Laité v. Clergy. Epping Forest. Parties and Party Names in the United States.  
Cemeteries at Home and Abroad. The "Renters" of Drury Lane Theatre.  
Spedding's Bacon. The Valleys of Tirol.  
George's Genealogical Tables. Slavonic Literary History.  
Patricia Kemball. Mayers's Chinese Reader's Manual. Walker's "Original."  
Vanessa. German Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

### ADVERTISEMENTS.

**OPERA COMIQUE.**—Miss AMY SHERIDAN has the honour to announce that the above Theatre will RE-OPEN THIS DAY (Saturday, Nov. 21), under her sole management, with an entirely new Opera Bouffe Extravaganza, by F. C. Burnand, called *IXION RE-WHEELED*. New and appropriate Scenery by W. L. Telbin and W. Hann. Costumes designed by Alfred Thompson. A new Act Drop painted by W. L. Telbin. Dresses by Miss Price and M. Alias. The selected Music and Overtures arranged and composed by W. C. Levey. A petite Comedy, written by John Oxenford and Horace Wigan, will also be produced, entitled *LOVE IN A FIX*. Artists engaged: Messrs. James Patten, Laverne, Eleanor Burton, Rose Berend, Alice Phillips, Louise Beverley, R. Power, Julia Vokins, Mabel Stuart, Amy Hathorley, C. Pearce, &c.; Messrs. J. D. Stoyte, F. Sullivan, R. Barker, Richard Temple, Gaston Murray, J. G. Jarvis, &c. Stage Manager: Mr. R. Barker. Box-office open daily from eleven till five, under the direction of Mr. W. Collier. Private boxes from 41 to 43 3s.; stalls, 7s. 6d.; dress circle, 5s.; back seats of circle, where bonnets may be worn, 4s.; upper circle, 2s. 6d.; amphitheatre, 1s. 6d.; gallery, 1s. No charge for booking.—GASTON MURRAY, Acting Manager.

**DORÉ'S GREAT PICTURE** of "CHRIST LEAVING the PRETORIUM," with "Dream of Pilate's Wife," "Night of the Crucifixion," "Soldiers of the Cross," "Christian Martyrs," "Francesca da Rimini," "Andromeda," &c.—DORÉ GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street. Ten to Six. Brilliantly lighted at dusk and on dull days. Admission, 1s.

**THE ARUNDEL SOCIETY'S FACSIMILES IN COLOUR** from the OLD MASTERS are Exhibited Free to the Public Daily, and Sold from 10s. to 45s. each. Descriptive Lists sent, post free, on application to 24 Old Bond Street, London, W.

**SMITHFIELD CLUB CATTLE SHOW.—THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL SHOW** will take place at the AGRICULTURAL HALL, Islington, on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, the 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th December.

### THE SCOTTISH CORPORATION.

President.

H.R.H. the PRINCE OF WALES, Duke of ROTHESAY, K.G., &amp;c.

Vice-Presidents.

His Grace the Duke of ROXBURGH, K.T.

His Grace the Duke of BUCCHLEUCH, K.G.

His Grace the Duke of RICHMOND and LENNOX, K.G.

His Grace the Duke of MONTROSE, K.T.

The Right Hon. the Earl of LAUDERDALE, K.C.B.

The Right Hon. the Earl of ROSEBURY.

Treasurer.—Sir JOHN HERON MAXWELL, Bart.

The TWO HUNDRED and TENTH ANNIVERSARY FESTIVAL of this Corporation will take place at the Freemasons' Tavern on St. Andrew's Day, Monday, November 24, when the Most Hon. the Marquis of HUNTLY, the Premier Marquis of Scotland, will occupy the Chair.

Subscriptions and Donations from Noblemen and Gentlemen who may not find it convenient to attend the Festival will be gratefully acknowledged on St. Andrew's Day. In order to secure places at the Dinner tables, applications for Tickets ought to be made to the Managing Stewards at the Hall.

The Scottish Corporation Hall, E.C., November 19, 1874.

MACRAE MOIR.

**PROFESSOR T. HEWITT KEYS' COURSE** on COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR, at University College, will commence on Thursday next, November 26, at Three o'clock, with a Lecture on Decepted Words, which will be open to the Public.

### MALVERN COLLEGE.

This College contains two Departments—the CLASSICAL and the MODERN. There is also a preparatory LOWER SCHOOL. There are Boarding-Houses within the College Grounds, held by the Head-Master and others of his Staff; a Gymnasium, &c.

Board and Tuition under Fourteen, £30; over Fourteen, £50. Non-Shareholders pay an extra Fee of 4s. Special advantages for Sons of Clergymen and Home Boarders.

For further information, apply to the Rev. ARTHUR PARKER, M.A., Head-Master, late Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford.

The Examination for Scholarships and Exhibitions on December 22 and 23.

### MALVERN COLLEGE.

THE ANNUAL EXAMINATION for SCHOLARSHIPS and EXHIBITIONS will be held on December 22 and 23. There will be awarded Six House Scholarships of £50, Four Founder's Scholarships of £20, and some Exhibitions of £30. The Awards will be for one, or for two years, according to merit, in Classics or Mathematics. For particulars apply to the HEAD-MASTER.

**SCHOLARSHIPS.—AN ELECTION TO FOUR ENTRANCE SCHOLARSHIPS.** Two of £50 a year. One of £30, and One of £20, will be held on Wednesday, April 21, 1875.—Apply to the HEAD-MASTER, Badley College, Abingdon.

**S. PETER'S SCHOOL, YORK.**—Two Foundation SCHOLARSHIPS and Two Free Scholarships are awarded annually at the Midsummer Examination. Foundation Scholarships entitle the Scholars to Free Board (in the Head-Master's house), and Free Education. Free Scholarships to Free Education only.—For full particulars apply to the Rev. the HEAD-MASTER.

**ABINGDON SCHOOL** (Six miles from Oxford).—An Old Foundation, with University Scholarships, having new Buildings and extensive Grounds. There are Classical and Modern sides, and a Public School training is given on moderate terms.—For particulars, and admission in January, apply to Rev. E. SUMMERS, Head-Master.

**A LADY and DAUGHTER** wish to receive a YOUNG LADY requiring a HOME and Chaperonage. Cheerful society and domestic comfort ensured. References exchanged.—Address, H., Brown's Library, Kensington Park Road, W.

**TRENT COLLEGE.**—A GRADUATE of CAMBRIDGE or OXFORD will be required in January, as ASSISTANT MASTER in the Upper School. There are four University men on the staff, very little house duty, good cricket and football games, in which the Masters take part. Salary to commence at £60, with Board and Lodging and Two Comfortable Rooms.—References and Copies of Testimonials to be sent before December 15, to Rev. T. F. FENN, M.A., Trent College, Nottingham.

**PRIVATE TUTOR or ASSISTANT-MASTER in a PUBLIC SCHOOL.**—An OXFORD GRADUATE is DISENGAGED. Seven years' experience. Very high testimonials.—Address, F. N. A., care of Messrs. Robinson, 56 Long Acre, W.C.

**WANTED, a HEAD-MISTRESS** for the **NORWICH HIGH SCHOOL** for GIRLS, of the Girls' Public Day School Company, Limited. Salary £250 a year, with Capitation Fees.—Apply, with copies of Testimonials, before December 14, to the SECRETARY, 112 Brompton Road, S.W.

**CHISLEHURST COMMON, Kent.**—To be **SOLD** or **LET**, Rent £130, a newly-erected Gothic VILLA, of handsome elevation, situate near Chislehurst Church and Camden Park. Seven Bedrooms, Bath-room, three Reception-rooms, Offices, and Gardens. Water and Gas laid on. The position of Chislehurst Common is well known, and is probably the most perfect round London, combining as it does splendid air, gravel soil, good surroundings, and close proximity to the Metropolis, being within half-an-hour by rail of Cannon Street or Charing Cross Stations; it may fairly be said to include the advantages of both Town and Country.—Messrs. DIBBENHAM, TEWSON, & FARMER, Auctioneers, 80 Cheap-side, E.C.

**HYDROPATHY.**—**SUDBROOK PARK, Richmond Hill.**  
Physician.—Dr. EDWARD LANE, M.A., M.D., Edin.  
For Invalids and those requiring rest and change. Turkish Baths on the premises.

**OVERLAND ROUTE and SUEZ CANAL.**—Under Contract for the conveyance of the Mails to the Mediterranean, India, China, Japan, and Australia. The Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company dispatch their Steamers from Southampton, via the Suez Canal, every Thursday, from Venice every Friday, and from Brindisi, with the Overland Mails, every Monday.—Offices, 122 Leadenhall Street, E.C., and 25 Cockspur Street, S.W.

**BRIGHTON.—BEDFORD HOTEL.**—Facing Sea and Esplanade. Near the West Pier. Central and quiet. Long established. Suites of Rooms. Spacious Coffee-room for Ladies and Gentlemen. Sea-Water Service in the Hotel.  
ROBERT PARK, Manager.

**AGREEABLE WINTER RESIDENCE.**—**ILFRACOMBE**  
HOTEL.—High and Equable Temperature. Moderate Charges "en Pension." Through Trains direct from Waterloo.

**WINTER at the GRANVILLE.**—Replete with Home comfort. Hydropathic, Turkish, Ozon, Saline, Plunge, and Medical Baths. Billiard and Concert Rooms; American Bowling Alley; beautiful Views, Sea and Shipping. Table-d'hôte 6.30 P.M.—Address, THE MANAGER, St. Lawrence-on-Sea, Ramsgate.

**COLLECTIONS of PHOTOGRAPHS.** Completed, Collated, carefully Re-mounted, Titled, and properly Bound, to open quite flat, and interleaved with Paper for Notes of Journey. Indexes made for reference.  
PHOTOGRAPHS of the BIG TREES, &c., in the YO-SEMITTE VALLEY.  
Large size. Splendid Pictures for Framing.  
MARION & CO., 21 and 23 Soho Square, London.

**E. DENT & CO., 61 Strand, and 34 Royal Exchange, Manufacturers of CHRONOMETERS, WATCHES, ASTRONOMICAL and TURRET CLOCKS, to Her Majesty, H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, and H.M. the Emperor of Russia; Makers of the Great Clock of the Houses of Parliament, and of the New Standard Clock of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich.** Catalogues on application.—E. DENT & CO., 61 Strand, 34 Royal Exchange (adjoining Lloyd's), and Factory, Savoy Street, London.

**CUTLERY, Warranted.**—The most varied Assortment of TABLE CUTLERY in the World, all warranted, is on Sale at **WILLIAM S. BURTON'S**.

The Blades are all of the finest Steel.	Table Knives.	Desert Knives.	Carvers.
	s. d.	s. d.	per Pair s. d.
34-inch Ivory Handles ..... per Dozen	18 -	13 -	" 6 9
3 ditto Balance ditto .....	19 -	14 -	" 6 9
3 ditto ditto .....	27 -	21 -	" 7 6
4 ditto fine Ivory Handles .....	35 -	26 -	" 9 6
4 ditto extra large ditto .....	42 -	33 -	" 10 6
4 ditto African Ivory ditto .....	42 -	33 -	" 10 6
Ditto, with Silver Ferules .....	42 -	36 -	" 12 6
Ditto, with Silvered Blades .....	52 -	40 -	" 18 -
Nickel Electro Silvered Handles .....	21 -	19 -	" 7 6

**WILLIAM S. BURTON, General Furnishing Ironmonger,** by appointment to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, sends a CATALOGUE, containing upwards of 550 Illustrations of his unrivalled Stock, with Lists of Prices and Plans of the 30 large Show-rooms, postage free.—30 Oxford Street, W.; 1, 2, 3, and 4 Newman Street; 4, 5, and 6 Perry's Place; and 1 Newman Yard, London, W. The Cost of delivering Goods to the most distant parts of the United Kingdom by Railway is trifling. **WILLIAM S. BURTON** will always undertake delivery at a small fixed rate.

**MAPPIN & WEBB'S**

**A 1 SPOONS and FORKS.**

**GUARANTEED to LAST**

**TWENTY YEARS. A WRITTEN GUARANTEE GIVEN TO EVERY PURCHASER.**

**OXFORD STREET, Nos. 76, 77, and 78, WEST END, LONDON.**

**MANSSION HOUSE BUILDINGS, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, CITY, LONDON.**

**MANUFACTORY and SHOW ROOMS, THE ROYAL CUTLERY WORKS, SHEFFIELD.**  
COSTLY ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUES ON RECEIPT OF 12 STAMPS.  
SMALLER EDITION POST FREE.

**H. J. NICOLL, Merchant Clothier to the Queen, the Royal Family, and the Courts of Europe; Army, Navy, and Civil Outfitter, 114, 116, 118, 120 Regent Street, and 22 Cornhill, London.** Also Branch Establishments at Manchester, 10 Mosley Street; Liverpool, 30 Bold Street; and Birmingham, 39 New Street.

**THE FASHIONS for the WINTER** are now ready, and to be had at the above addresses. The Stock will be found to embrace much that is novel and approved in style, in combination with Materials of sterling value and good wearing properties, while the make and finish of each Article are attended to with great care.

**FOR GENTLEMEN.**—Several Fashionable Novelties in Style and Material for OVERCOATS are prepared. Very choice Fabrics for Frock and Morning Coats, &c. Home-spun Cheviots for Suits. Distinguishing Patterns in Angoras for Trouserings.

**FOR BOYS.**—Very tasteful DESIGNS in SUITS, &c., for Younger Boys; and "Regulation" Suits, as worn at Eton, Harrow, Rugby, and other great Schools. Shirts, Hosiery, Hats, &c., suitable for each Dress.

**FOR LADIES.**—Several new DESIGNS in POLONAISE COSTUMES and JACKETS, amongst which are the "Beatrice" and "Russian Navy." Being made of Woollen Fabric, the same skill in fitting and workmanship is required as in the production of Gentlemen's Clothing and Ladies' Riding Habits. The Ladies' Ulster "Dreadnought," with Self-Contracting Waist-Belt, introduced and registered by H. J. NICOLL, for Walkin or Travelling, is rain-repellent, and yet thoroughly evaporable.  
To be had only at H. J. NICOLL'S several Addresses, 114, 116, 118, 120 Regent Street, and 22 Cornhill, London; 10 Mosley Street, Manchester; 30 Bold Street, Liverpool; and 39 New Street, Birmingham.

**CLARK'S PATENT STEEL NOISELESS SHUTTERS.**  
Self-Colling. Fire and Theft Proof, can be adapted to any Window or other Opening. Prospectuses free.—CLARK & CO., Sole Patentees, Rathbone Place, W.; Paris, Manchester, Liverpool, and Dublin.

**GOOD FLOOR CLOTH.—TRELOAR & SONS,**  
60 LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.

**WOOD TAPESTRY DECORATIONS.**—**HOWARD'S**  
PATENT.—Wood Tapestry can be applied to all even surfaces, being an adaptation of real wood, in lieu of painting or paper-hanging; beautiful in effect and exceedingly durable.  
HOWARD & SONS,  
Decorators, 25, 26, & 27 Berners Street, London, W.

**STAINED GLASS WINDOWS and CHURCH DECORATIONS.**—HEATON, BUTLER, & BAYNE, Garrick Street, Covent Garden, London. Prize Medals, London and Paris.

**THE AGRA BANK, Limited.**—Established in 1833.  
CAPITAL, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE.—NICHOLAS LANE, LOMBARD STREET, LONDON.

BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

Current Accounts are kept at the Head Office on the Terms customary with London Bankers, and Interest allowed when the Credit Balance does not fall below £100.

Deposits received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.:

At 5 per cent. per ann., subject to 12 months' Notice of Withdrawal.

For shorter periods Deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon.

Bills issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank, free of extra charge; and Approved Bills purchased or sent for collection.

Sales and Purchases effected in British and Foreign Securities, in East India Stock and Loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken.

Interest drawn, and Army, Navy, and Civil Pay and Pensions realized.

Every other description of Banking Business and Money Agency, British and Indian, transacted.

J. THOMSON, Chairman.

**EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.**  
Established 1782.

MANSSION-HOUSE STREET, LONDON.

Directors.

Right Hon. Lord TREDEGAR, President.

Sir Frederick Pollock, Bart., Vice-President.

George Scovell, Esq., John Cosgrove, Esq., James Spiller, Esq., John Kemp Welch, Esq., George Frederick White, Esq.

Ex-Directors.

Sir Walter Charles James, Bart., Richard Twining, Esq., John Walter, Esq., M.P.

The **EQUITABLE** is the oldest Life Office on the Mutual System in the world.

It has never allowed Commission or employed Agents.

By non-payment of the ordinary minimum Commission of 5 per Cent., more than TWO MILLIONS STERLING have been saved to the Policy-holders.

FINANCIAL POSITION.

Present Cash Assets more than ..... £1,000,000

Present Annual Revenue, more than ..... 330,000

Whole Working Expenses ..... 7,500

All Policies taken out this year (1874) will participate in the next Division of Profits, which will take place on January 1, 1880.

The returns to the Board of Trade show that the aggregate working expenses of all the Life Offices in the United Kingdom give an average (including Commission, where paid) of more than 94 per Cent. on the sum of their gross incomes.

The whole Working Expenses of the **EQUITABLE** average about 2½ per cent. on its Annual Income.

J. W. STEPHENSON, Actuary.

**THE LEGAL and GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,**

10 FLEET STREET, TEMPLE BAR, (Founded 1836.)

Has taken a leading part in freeing Assurance Contracts from complication.

The Policies are indisputable.

The Valuation Reserves afford the highest known degree of security.

The Bonus recently declared was unusually large.

The Assured receive Nine-tenths of the Profits.

The guaranteeing Capital of One Million is held by nearly Three Hundred Members of the Legal Profession.

Trustees.

The Right Hon. the LORD CHANCELLOR.

The Right Hon. Lord HATHERLEY.

The Right Hon. Lord COLERIDGE, Lord Chief Justice, C.P.

The Right Hon. Sir EDWARD VAUGHAN WILLIAMS.

Sir THOMAS TILSON.

THOMAS WEBB GREENE, Esq., Q.C.

ROBERT BATLY POLLETT, Esq., Taxing Master in Chancery.

GEORGE BURROW GREGORY, Esq., M.P.

WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Esq.

Solicitors.—Messrs. DOMVILLE, LAWRENCE, & GRAHAM.

Explanatory Reports and Parliamentary Returns will be forwarded.

E. A. NEWTON, Actuary and Manager.

**LAW LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY, Fleet Street, London.**

Invested assets on December 31, 1873 ..... £5,186,748

Income for the past year ..... 567,284

Amount paid on death to December last ..... 9,856,739

Forms of proposal, &c., will be sent on application at the Office.

**IMPERIAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.**  
Established 1803.

1 OLD BROAD STREET, E.C., and 16 & 17 PALL MALL, S.W.

CAPITAL, £1,500,000. PAID-UP and INVESTED, £700,000.

E. COZENS SMITH, General Manager.

**LONDON and SOUTHWARK FIRE and LIFE INSURANCE.**

Chairman.—HENRY ASTE, Esq.

CHIEF OFFICE.—73 and 74 KING WILLIAM STREET, E.C.

**PHENIX FIRE OFFICE,**  
LOMBARD STREET and CHANCERY CROSS, LONDON.—ESTABLISHED 1782.

Prompt and liberal Loss Settlements.

Insurances effected in all parts of the World.

GEORGE WM. LOVELL } Secretaries.  
JOHN J. BROOMFIELD }

**EAGLE INSURANCE COMPANY.**  
Established 1807. (For Lives only.)  
79 PALL MALL, LONDON.

Premiums and Interest ..... £150,383

Accumulated Funds ..... £3,294,108

Also, a Subscribed Capital of more than ..... £1,500,000.

The Annual Report of the Company's state and progress, Prospectuses and Forms, may be had, or will be sent, post free, on application at the Office, or to any of the Company's Agents.

GEORGE HUMPHREYS, Actuary and Secretary.

**HEATHERSIDE NURSERIES.**  
NURSERIES (270 ACRES IN EXTENT) NEAR BAGSHOT, SURREY.  
SEED ESTABLISHMENT and LONDON DEPOT.  
QUEEN VICTORIA STREET,  
CLOSE TO THE MANSSION HOUSE STATION.  
A London Branch has just been opened as above, where a succession of Sample Plants will  
FLOWER, VEGETABLE, and AGRICULTURAL SEED  
BUSINESS  
Will be carried on, and made a special object.  
The very extensive Stock is, this season, in splendid condition. It includes every species of Ornamental Trees and Shrubs, evergreen and deciduous (of all sizes), Fruit Trees, Roses, Rhododendrons, &c.  
Buyers are invited to visit the Nurseries, at Bagshot, to inspect and personally select what they require to be sent to them when removal is safe.  
DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUES OBTAINABLE ON APPLICATION.  
Please address orders to  
THOMAS THORNTON,  
Heathside Nurseries, Bagshot.  
Forest Trees, when taken in quantity, charged at a proportionately reduced price.